

Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against the passage of the Wagner bill (S. 1161); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5533. By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL: Petitions of the Hall Furlough Club, No. 1, Endicott, N. Y., and signed by 33 other residents of the Thirty-fourth Congressional District, urging the passage of the Hall furlough bill (H. R. 1504) providing free transportation during furlough for members of our armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5534. By Mr. JOSEPH M. PRATT: Petition protesting against the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5535. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of Martha Payson and other citizens of Brooks, urging action on Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of all alcoholic liquors near camps and defense industries; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5536. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, specialist in management and statistical control, petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his filing of income-tax returns; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

FRIDAY, APRIL 21, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Ruler of all nature, in the blue beauty of the soft spring skies and the blossoming glory of the awakened earth our hearts sing with the singing birds:

"This is my Father's world * * *
And though the wrong seems oft so strong
God is the ruler yet."

Day and night, Thou knowest our poignant thoughts are with our absent sons and daughters who across these terror-stricken days march and sail and fly against cruel foes. We think gratefully of the armies of youth who have inherited such a sorry world, called to contend to the death with the unleashed powers of darkness. The courage and cheerfulness of these knights of the trackless air in the face of deadly peril shame our petty complaints and our magnified discomfures here in our homeland and theirs. Give us prophetic glimpses of the new earth we can construct if together, after this holocaust of hate is past, we harness the sacrifices, the grim resolves, the ingenuities of war to the service of all Thy children. And as today and in the days to come, in this historic Chamber, Thy servants face questions of national concern, may every decision add something to the growing vision of the far-off years as they may be if redeemed by the sons of God; that with bows of burning gold and with the sharpened arrows of desire we, too, may do battle for Thy children and ours. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, April 18, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 962. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Frank Holehan;

S. 1399. An act for the relief of Frank Knowles;

S. 1433. An act for the relief of Clarence A. Giddens;

S. 1484. An act for the relief of Walter Eugene Hayes;

S. 1517. An act for the relief of Staff Sgt. Marion Johnson, United States Marine Corps, and Sgt. George B. Kress, United States Marine Corps Reserve;

S. 1542. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in building B. O. Q. 0-3 at the United States naval construction training center, Davisville, R. I., on March 27, 1943;

S. 1632. An act for the relief of Capt. S. E. McCarty (Supply Corps), United States Navy;

S. 1676. An act for the relief of Sgt. Maj. Richard Shaker, United States Marine Corps;

S. 1677. An act for the relief of Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Newt A. Smith, United States Naval Reserve, for the value of personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire occurring on August 11, 1943, in quarters occupied by him in the armory of Aviation Free Gunnery Unit, Dam Neck, Va.; and

S. 1681. An act to provide for reimbursement of certain Marine Corps personnel attached to Marine Utility Squadron 152 for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire in officers' quarters on February 9, 1943.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3257) to amend Subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. PITTINGER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark;

H. R. 1045. An act for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Lessie C. Selman;

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Salfi;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of J. G. Sullivan;

H. R. 2576. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leaser;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2788. An act for the relief of Frank Baptiste;

H. R. 2874. An act for the relief of Robert Will Starks;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased;

H. R. 2965. An act for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3674. An act for the relief of William E. Widby;

H. R. 3739. An act for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.;

H. R. 3859. An act for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck;

H. R. 3977. An act for the relief of Harry Schultz;

H. R. 4254. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; and

H. R. 4361. An act for the relief of Arch A. Brown.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 80) authorizing the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives to have printed for its use additional copies of the hearings held before that committee during the current session relative to post-war planning, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 866. An act to fix the compensation of registers of the district land offices in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and

H. R. 3257. An act to amend Subtitle—Insurance of title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to authorize suspension of the statute of limitations in certain cases, and for other purposes.

SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON RIVER AND HARBOR BILL

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are many who

are interested in the river and harbor bill and wish to know when different projects in connection with it are to be taken up by the subcommittee handling the bill, I am submitting a schedule of hearings on the bill and ask that it be published in the RECORD at this point in order that Senators and others interested may be advised.

There being no objection, the schedule was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

April 25: Army engineers on new projects reported to Congress since action by the House.

April 26, 27, 28: Tennessee-Tombigbee and Alabama-Cocosa projects.

May 1, 2: Beaver-Mahoning Canal, Ohio.

May 3: Amendment concerning Assawoman Island project, Virginia; Erie, Pa., project; Larchmont Harbor, N. Y.

May 4, 5: Section 4, concerning Central Valley project, California; Department of the Interior and Senator Bone amendments.

May 8: Missouri River project.

THIRTY-FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF DEATH OF SAMUEL L. CLEMENS

MR. TRUMAN. Mr. President, today marks the thirty-fourth anniversary of the death of Samuel L. Clemens, better known as Mark Twain, who was a native of my State, having lived in Hannibal. Mark Twain was the greatest humorist in the world, who made the world happier by living in it. His keen observations will live forever.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PRESIDENTIAL, VICE PRESIDENTIAL, AND SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN EXPENDITURES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of the members of the Special Committee to Investigate Presidential, Vice Presidential, and Senatorial Campaign Expenditures in 1944, under the terms of Senate Resolution 263, agreed to March 30, 1944, as follows: The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWAR], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON].

INVITATION TO ATTEND INTERNATIONAL LABOR CONFERENCE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter of invitation from the Secretary of Labor, which was read and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, April 13, 1944.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: I wish to extend to Members of the Senate an invitation to attend the sessions of the International Labor Conference, which will open at 11 o'clock in the morning, April 20, in Philadelphia, Mitten Hall, Temple University. At this meeting 300 delegates representing 40 countries will come together to discuss and vote on recommendations to the United Nations for present and post-war policy, and to outline plans for the maintenance of high employment levels after the war. Each national delegation will be composed not only of official government delegates but will also include representatives of employer and labor organizations from each country. Senator

THOMAS of Utah and I have been appointed by the President as the two Government delegates of the United States. The names of the employer and labor delegates are about to be announced.

This will be the twenty-sixth annual conference of the International Labor Organization, of which the United States has been a member for 10 years. It is being held here at the official invitation of our Government. The conference in Philadelphia will offer an unparalleled opportunity for observing the proceedings of an international congress at first hand. This world assembly follows the same pattern as that of the United States Congress. In addition to plenary sessions, there will be a number of working committees and group caucuses. The importance of the topics on its program and the gravity of the present world situation should lend historical significance to the proceedings.

I sincerely hope that a number of Senators, despite their busy schedules, will be able to attend the conference some time during the 3-week period of its sessions. If Senators will communicate with me, I shall be glad to see that they are provided with appropriate cards of admission and detailed information as to how the program will be developed.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCES PERKINS.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report stating all of the facts and pertinent provisions of law in the cases of 142 individuals whose deportation has been suspended for more than 6 months under authority vested in the Attorney General, together with a statement of the reason for such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Immigration.

REPORT OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

A letter from the Chairman of the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the annual report of that Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF THE CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to further amend the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; to bring about uniformity and coordination in the allocation of field positions to the grades of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Chairman of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, and the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of Commerce (revised estimate), transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for their respective offices for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs:

"No. 10. Resolution of the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico

"Whereas by virtue of an Executive order of the honorable the President of the United States of America, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, there was constituted in our country in May 1935 an agency of the Federal Government named the Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration, in charge of undertaking the necessary activities for carrying out the purposes indicated by its name, and that action was taken by the honorable the President of the United States, exercising his faculties and powers with a lofty and humanitarian sense of justice, as a consequence of the deplorable situation which our island was facing, with its agriculture ruined, its lack of vital industries, its commerce impoverished, and its legions of men with idle hands due to the devastating hurricanes that razed our cities, our towns, and our fields when we had not yet recuperated from the serious financial crisis caused by the last World War;

"Whereas among the various rehabilitation programs wisely adopted by the said Federal agency there is the organization and award in usufruct of agricultural farm settlements in the rural districts to workmen who rendered their services on the farms needing rehabilitation, the said awards being made on the basis of the payment of a certain monthly rent which is not credited against the price of the farm until the said farmer has occupied the farm for 5 or more years, a policy which causes the said farmer to lose his love for both his farm and his work, and for such reason legions of farmers are seen leaving their farms because they believe that these will never become their property;

"Whereas it is a well known fact that the occupants of the said farms absolutely lack food or resources, and due to the abnormal conditions which Puerto Rico is now suffering on account of the war, which unfortunately will last for some time, the farmers have no income or work, and due to the lack of fertilizer cannot cultivate their farms as in peacetimes, and with the aggravating circumstance that the cost of living, both for food and household goods, has increased enormously for them;

"Whereas the circumstances outlined in the preceding paragraph determine, as an unquestionable fact, that the said farmers cannot hereafter pay the rent which they are obligated to pay, and it is considered that an altruistic expression on the part of Congress, in behalf of Puerto Rico, where the United States has only enthusiastic and decided cooperation in its democratic endeavors, would convey to the homes of those farmers, now worried, the ease of mind and the individual independence entailed by the possession of a piece of land of their own which may protect them from any possible attempt at exploitation and oppression in their work: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of Puerto Rico:

"SECTION 1. To submit, as it is hereby submitted through this resolution, an earnest appeal to the Congress of the United States of America to pass the bill introduced in that honorable legislative body by the Honorable Bolívar Pagán, Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, resolving to direct and directing the proper body or authority to grant in favor of each and all of the farmers occupying the farms specified in the second whereas above, a title of ownership for the sum which they have paid as rent up to this date.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the honorable the President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, to the two Houses that compose the Congress of the United States, to the chairman of the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the Committee on Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives of the United States; to the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, to

the Honorable Claude R. Wickard, Secretary of Agriculture; and to the Honorable Bolivar Pagan, Resident Commissioner for Puerto Rico in Washington, requesting the latter to ask that said bill be considered."

A resolution by Local No. 1391, Screen Office Employees Guild, Hollywood, Calif., favoring the extension of the Emergency Price Control Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution by Local No. 1391, Screen Office Employees Guild, Hollywood, Calif., favoring expansion of the O. P. A. subsidy program so as to hold the cost of living in line; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Resolutions adopted by the National Maritime Union of America, Cairo, Ill.; Local 1-9, International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union; Local Union No. 106, International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Drop Forgers, and Helpers; and Local No. 104, International Brotherhood of Boiler Makers, Iron Ship Builders, and Helpers of America, all of Seattle, Wash., favoring the adoption of measures to establish a Nation-wide broadcast of the proceedings of Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition which has come to me from Rev. Otho G. Brewer, of Clayton, Del., signed by numerous citizens, asking for favorable action on Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

I also ask unanimous consent to present a petition which has come to me from Rev. W. B. Ruddock, of the Cheswold Methodist Church, signed by numerous citizens of Cheswold, Del., also asking for favorable action on Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Delaware will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ELIMINATION OF POLL TAX IN ELECTION OF FEDERAL OFFICERS—PETITION

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a petition, signed by numerous seamen, relative to the abolishment of the payment of poll taxes, and requesting the enactment of pending legislation relating thereto, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

Senator WALLACE WHITE,
Senate Minority Leader,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

As seamen who have been through battle we know how terribly our Nation suffers from disunity rooted and fostered in the poll-tax States. We know from life the falseness of color prejudice for there is no segregation or discrimination on N. M. U. ships. Our first national act in support of the Atlantic Charter, Moscow, and Tehran must be eradication of poll tax.

All N. M. U. men, their voting dependents, and relations are awaiting your support. We are urging you to use your influence to

get your party members to support cloture and accept no amendments for the passage of H. R. 7.

WALTER E. HARRIS, Jr.,
HADLEY A. COLLINS,
DANIEL F. WOODS
(And sundry other citizens).

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations, I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 795) thereon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, in connection with the Navy Department appropriation bill, which I have just reported, I wish to give notice, in accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, that it is my intention to move to suspend the applicable rule of the Senate in order to take up certain legislative amendments to the Navy Department appropriation bill.

Mr. OVERTON submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 4559) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1945, and additional appropriations therefor for the fiscal year 1944, and for other purposes, the following amendments namely:

Amendment No. 1: On page 23, after line 15, insert the following:

"NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

"The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed, upon request of the Secretary of the Navy, to transfer \$1,000,000 from the naval emergency fund (17X0300) to the naval procurement fund (Public Law 653, approved July 3, 1942), and advances by check or warrant and reimbursements to the naval procurement fund from naval appropriations may be made on the basis of the estimated costs of a project without further accounting distribution of expenditures to the individual appropriations involved."

Amendment No. 2: On page 26, line 4, after the word "diem", insert the following: "Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized and directed to sell the tract of land of approximately 532.4 acres, in Cleveland County, Okla., commonly known as Moore Field, and more particularly described in, and acquired through, a declaration of taking executed by the Under Secretary of the Navy and filed in the United States District Court for the Western District of Oklahoma, and judgment entered thereon, in the proceedings in such court entitled 'United States of America, petitioner, against 532.4 Acres of Land, More or Less, in Cleveland County, Okla., and Mrs. J. R. Holliday, and Others, defendants, No. 1120-Civil,' and to execute and deliver a deed, or deeds, to the person, or persons, or their heirs or assigns, from whom the original holdings were acquired: *Provided further,*

That the sale price for such land shall be a sum sufficient to cover the original purchase price and any sums expended by the Navy Department upon such land or arising out of the use and occupancy thereof by the Navy Department: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to make rules and regulations necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this section."

Amendment No. 3: On page 26, line 13, after the word "equipment", insert the following: "*Provided further,* That no part of these funds shall be used for the construction of new naval facilities or the enlargement of existing naval facilities in the continental United States unless the Secretary of the Navy first determines that no existing facilities, publicly or privately owned, are, or can be made, available for the purposes to be served at a cost deemed reasonable by him."

Amendment No. 4: On page 55, add a new section as follows:

"DEFENSE AID

"SEC. 120. Subject to authorization by other law for the rendering of defense aid, information and services, the authority contained in section 103 of the Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943, is hereby extended to and made applicable to the appropriations for the naval service made subsequent to such act and contained in this act without any increase in the amount limitation fixed in such section: *Provided,* That 'information and services,' authorized to be rendered by the act of March 11, 1941 (Public, 11), need not be connected with the procurement or disposition of any defense article."

Mr. OVERTON also submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 4559, the naval appropriation bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERTSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1572. A bill for the relief of Frank Robertson; with amendments (Rept. No. 796);
H. R. 1628. A bill for the relief of John Hirsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 797);
H. R. 2438. A bill for the relief of Bernadine Salmons; without amendment (Rept. No. 798);

H. R. 2472. A bill for the relief of the estate of Gertrude Mullins; with an amendment (Rept. No. 800); and

H. R. 2757. A bill for the relief of Margaret Hamilton, Mrs. Catherine Higgins, Mrs. Rebecca Sallap, and Mrs. Dora Profjansky; without amendment (Rept. No. 799).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 2332. A bill for the relief of Christian Wenz; without amendment (Rept. No. 801).

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 1565. A bill relating to the appointment of postmasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 802).

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 4278. A bill to provide for the control and eradication of certain animal and plant pests and diseases, to facilitate cooperation with the States in fire control, to provide for the more efficient protection and management of the national forests, to facilitate the carrying out of agricultural conservation and related agricultural programs, to facilitate

the operation of the Farm Credit Administration and the Rural Electrification Administration, to aid in the orderly marketing of agricultural commodities, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 803).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred for examination and recommendation two lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on April 17, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1028) to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TRUMAN:

S. 1852. A bill for the relief of John W. Giesecke; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1853. A bill for the relief of Dr. Frank K. Boland, Sr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 1854. A bill for the relief of Walter S. Faulkner (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 1855. A bill for the relief of Lewis Harkins; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1856. A bill to increase the maximum amount of national service life insurance which may be carried by any person in the armed forces by an amount equal to \$5,000 for each child of such person; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 1857. A bill granting an increase in pension to Esther Ann Hill Morgan; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1858 (by request). A bill to give honorably discharged, disabled, or retired marine employees of the Panama Canal civil-service preference, to extend to them the facilities of the Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Inter-oceanic Canals.

(Mr. MALONEY introduced Senate Joint Resolution 122, which was passed and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. J. Res. 123. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11, 1944, General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EMPLOYMENT OF COUNSEL BY PETROLEUM RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 122) to limit the operation of sections 109 and

113 of the Criminal Code, and sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes, and certain other provisions of law, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That nothing in section 109 or section 113 of the Criminal Code (U. S. C., 1940 edition, title 18, secs. 198 and 203), or in section 361, section 365, or section 366 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 5, secs. 306, 314, and 315), or in any other provision of Federal law imposing restrictions, requirements, or penalties in relation to the employment of persons, the performance of services, or the payment or receipt of compensation in connection with any claim, proceeding, or matter involving the United States, shall apply with respect to counsel to the special committee of the Senate serving under the provisions of Senate Resolution 253, Seventy-eighth Congress, adopted March 13, 1944.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut give us a brief explanation of what is involved in the joint resolution?

Mr. MALONEY. I should like to do so, Mr. President, and, because it is a technical matter, I have prepared a statement.

This resolution has been authorized by the so-called Petroleum Resources Committee of the Senate to meet the situation which confronts the committee with respect to the proposed employment of Richard Joyce Smith as its chief counsel for a period of several months, and the employment of other counsel as may be required by the committee on a temporary basis.

Mr. Smith is a member of the New York City law firm of Whitman, Ransom, Coulson & Goetz. That law firm has numerous clients, many of whom have tax claims pending against the Federal Government, and are or may be involved in various administrative proceedings before Federal agencies which might be construed to be a "proceeding, contract, claim, controversy, charge, accusation, arrest, or other matter or thing in which the United States is a party, or directly or indirectly interested"—section 113, Criminal Code.

Since it is proposed to retain Mr. Smith as chief counsel of the committee on a temporary basis, it is not feasible for Mr. Smith either to withdraw from his law firm or to waive his participation under the partnership agreement in the net fees of the law firm. Because of that situation, Mr. Smith has raised the question as to the possible application of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code to him if he is to act as chief counsel for the committee. Further questions appear also possibly to be raised under sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes.

Sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code provide penalties against any person who being an officer of the United States or discharging any official function thereunder, or being a clerk of the United States, joins in the prosecution in the support of any claim against the United States, or receives, directly or indirectly, any compensation for any services rendered in relation to any proceeding or claim or controversy in which the United States is a party, or is directly or indirectly interested.

Sections 361, 365, and 366 of the Revised Statutes provide that no fee shall be allowed or paid to any attorney or counselor for any service which is required to be rendered of officers of the Department of Justice, and also provide in effect that the Department of Justice shall have control over the naming of Government counsel. It is probably doubtful that these latter sections of the Revised Statutes would be applicable in this matter. However, following the precedents established in other cases, it is advisable to have the exemption proposed in the joint resolution apply to these sections also.

While this question arises initially with respect to the committee's retaining Mr. Smith as its chief counsel, it is anticipated, in view of the shortage of qualified lawyers, that the committee may be unable to retain additional counsel, except upon a temporary basis under which such additional counsel would be permitted to continue to participate in professional fees for private practice.

Mr. Smith as a lawyer is bound under the ethics of his profession, by all the sanctions of professional censure and other punishment, not to engage in any professional activity which would be inconsistent or incompatible with his work as counsel for the Senate committee. Mr. Smith has represented to the committee that his law firm is not engaged in any work which, from a professional point of view, would be deemed incompatible with his work as counsel for this committee.

Specifically, he has assured the committee that neither he nor any members of his firm represent any oil companies or interests whose business would be the subject of the committee's investigation. The proposed exemption is merely to limit the broad application of general statutory provisions as they might be held applicable to Mr. Smith under his retainer as counsel for the committee.

It should be noted that these provisions of the Criminal Code became law many years ago, when claims or controversies in which the United States might be a party, or directly or indirectly interested, represented a minor part of the general practice of the law. Because of the increase in Federal regulation in recent years, there is probably no well-established law office with a general practice, and having the usual cross-section of business and individual clients, which does not at any given time have pending before some department of the Federal Government a matter which might be construed as a claim or controversy in which the United States is directly or indirectly interested. The statutes in question certainly were not enacted on the basis of the present ramification of Federal regulation.

Therefore, unless some such exemption is adopted as is proposed by this joint resolution, it will be difficult for a committee of the Congress to secure the best available legal talent. This difficulty is increased under war conditions, which have caused a pronounced shortage of qualified lawyers.

The exemption is not proposed to permit counsel for the committee to continue

his active private practice while at the same time working for the committee. Except for incidental consultations, Mr. Smith will be devoting his full time to committee affairs.

The chairman of the committee referred this question to the Attorney General, and received from him an informal opinion that an employee of a congressional committee is an officer or clerk in the employ of the United States within the meaning of sections 109 and 113. But the Attorney General apparently is not prepared to advise that Mr. Smith's situation as outlined above would not fall within the technical provisions of those sections.

The proposal of a joint resolution to limit the operation of these statutes is not new. The same procedure has been followed in the past. Attention is directed to House Joint Resolution 230, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session, which the proposed resolution follows in form, and which was designed to cover the employment of counsel by the House under House Resolution 386, Seventy-eighth Congress. The report of the House Committee on the Judiciary accompanying House Joint Resolution 230, Report 1117, also states that a similar resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 54, Sixty-eighth Congress, first session, Forty-third United States Statutes, pages 5, 6, was passed to enable Owen J. Roberts to appear in the Teapot Dome cases.

I should like to advise the distinguished minority leader that I discussed this matter at length with the Department of Justice and with the Attorney General, and that in our committee and everywhere else there is unanimous approval of the contemplated action.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will yield, I should like to say to him from the minority side of his committee that we totally agree with his statement. The joint resolution is not only essential but desirable.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H. R. 527. An act for the relief of Mary Hertz;

H. R. 933. An act for the relief of Conrad H. Clark;

H. R. 1045. An act for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Robinson;

H. R. 1668. An act for the relief of Lessie C. Selman;

H. R. 2387. An act for the relief of John Saffi;

H. R. 2470. An act for the relief of J. G. Sullivan;

H. R. 2576. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by Duffy Bros., Inc.;

H. R. 2601. An act for the relief of Mrs. Flossie Leaser;

H. R. 2624. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine,

and render judgment upon the claim of J. R. Dixon;

H. R. 2788. An act for the relief of Frank Baptiste;

H. R. 2874. An act for the relief of Robert Will Starks;

H. R. 2916. An act for the relief of Mrs. Winnie Singleton, as administratrix of the estate of Gaylord W. Singleton, deceased;

H. R. 2965. An act for the relief of Ross Engineering Co.;

H. R. 3038. An act for the relief of Mrs. Grace Page;

H. R. 3296. An act for the relief of R. Guy Dorsey;

H. R. 3388. An act for the relief of John P. Hayes, postmaster, and the estate of Edward P. McCormack, former postmaster, at Albany, N. Y.;

H. R. 3535. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Billie Stooksberry, a minor, and Lon L. Stooksberry;

H. R. 3674. An act for the relief of William E. Widby;

H. R. 3739. An act for the relief of the Wesix Electric Heater Co.;

H. R. 3859. An act for the relief of E. Bird Giles and Sherman Beck;

H. R. 3977. An act for the relief of Harry Schultz; and

H. R. 4361. An act for the relief of Arch A. Brown; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 1718. An act for the relief of Garnet Charles Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 4254. An act to extend for 1 year the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RIVER AND HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BYRD submitted an amendment, and Mr. WEEKS (for himself and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 3961) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

IMPROVEMENT OF THE SAULT STE. MARIE (MICH.) POWER PLANT—AMENDMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. I submit an amendment to House bill 3961, authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, which I propose to offer at the appropriate time, covering the construction of a new hydroelectric power plant in the St. Marys River, Mich. I present the amendment together with accompanying papers, including a letter from Representative FRED BRADLEY, of Michigan, and a copy of the hearings before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors on the subject, and ask that the amendment be printed and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be received and printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DISCLOSURE OF INFORMATION OBTAINED THROUGH CENSORSHIP

Mr. REED submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 282), which was referred

to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to the censorship of communications under section 303 of the First War Powers Act, 1941, with particular reference to the use and unauthorized disclosure of information obtained through such censorship. The committee shall report to the Senate at the earliest practicable date the results of its study and investigation, together with such recommendations as it may deem desirable.

For the purpose of this study and investigation, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$1,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MANPOWER AND WAR PRODUCTION

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, today through the press and by radio and other means of communication the people of America, and probably of the world, are being informed that vital industry faces a draft of 1,385,000 young men for the armed forces, probably to be taken between the ages of 18 and 26.

Notwithstanding the great confusion of information we have had upon this subject during the past 2 weeks, there is no escaping this necessity, for our divisions must be capable of being replenished by replacements made necessary by casualties within 36 hours after the casualties occur. Those replacements have to be made with men competent, in the matter of age and physical condition, to take the places of the casualties. Not only that, they must be drawn from industry and agriculture early enough so that they may have the training necessary to qualify them for their own protection in battle and for the protection of their comrades into whose ranks they are to be infiltrated in the line of battle.

In addition to the obvious shortage which would be created by the draft of such men from industry and agriculture, the country is being informed of a demand by railways for 101,000 men during the ensuing year, by the lumber industries for 121,000 men, and there are demands from various other industries, such as those producing radar devices, ball bearings, landing craft, and the larger type of planes, as well as mines, particularly those from which mica and such products are taken. So the demand for manpower is about to be much greater than it has been in the past, and of a vital character, a demand which will call for capacity to mobilize our people quite flexibly and quite promptly.

We have also the information that today the turn-over in our factories is greater than it has ever been heretofore. Although the graph does not show a continuously smooth curve upward, yet for the past 4 years the curve, by ups and downs, has gradually attained a higher level all the time, until at its present point we have to have an average of five men in line to take the place of the one man who is separated from his job either by being inducted into the armed forces or by virtue of his own quitting for reasons which seem satisfactory to him.

In the situation which we face today I think that Congress should give publicity to facts which are contained in the text of the statement by the three men under whom directly all the production of munitions is made, that is, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission. The statement was made following a meeting yesterday with about 65 of the leaders of industry who are principally organized in the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Manufacturers' Association, and the Association of American Railways.

Regarding this meeting and the statement, the Washington Post this morning published an article by Ben W. Gilbert containing the full text of the statement issued, and I ask unanimous consent that the article, with the statement, be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

At the same time I ask consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of this morning which refers specifically to the duty of Congress in this situation. In order to have the point before Senators at the time my request is submitted, I read the last paragraph of the editorial:

This third recommendation points straight toward the enactment of some form of national war service legislation which will impose upon able-bodied citizens at home, whose efforts are needed on the war-production line, the same legal and moral obligations to help with this war which now rest solely upon young men of draft age. The case for such legislation is presented strongly and, in our judgment, unanswerably, in the statement issued yesterday in Washington by Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox and Admiral Land. The fact that this statement was issued after conferences in which General Marshall and Admiral King participated and in which the whole problem of manpower was reviewed ought to gain for it the immediate attention of Congress, despite the now threadbare comment that "this is an election year."

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Vermont?

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of April 21, 1944]
VITAL INDUSTRY FACES DRAFT OF 1,385,000—SERVICE LAW DEMANDED BY STIMSON, KNOX, LAND—NEEDED TO INSURE CARRYING OUT WAR PROGRAMS, THEY SAY; BUSINESS DEMURS

(By Ben W. Gilbert)

Bidding for industrial support for national service legislation, the heads of the War and Navy Departments and Maritime Commission warned last night that the armed forces

would have to induct at least 1,385,000 additional men this year mainly from vital industries which must find replacements and in many instances increase their working forces.

Industry—speaking through the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce—promptly expressed unequivocal opposition to any labor draft, while some civilian agency heads were reported bringing pressure to bear on Selective Service to protect vital war industries from possible disruption by the draft when the induction of men over 26 in essential activity is resumed.

PRODUCTION LOSS FEARED

One official who asked that his name be withheld asserted that the Nation was in danger of losing its industrial power unless it took steps to protect men over 26 in key industries with measurable skills, particularly technicians and administrative personnel.

Moves also were under way to obtain clarification of draft policies to remove the uncertainty hanging over hundreds of thousands of family heads by the recent indefinite postponement of induction of men over 26 in essential activities. In the District, scores of men over 30 who were classified I-A prior to the issuance of the induction stay order have experienced difficulty finding jobs because of the uncertainty of their draft status, even though the services have stated that they do not want older men.

Meanwhile, the House Military Affairs Committee endorsed a report of its special subcommittee headed by Representative JOHN M. COSTELLO, Democrat, of California, asking the armed services to induct for non-combatant duty those IV-F's who refused to enter activities contributing directly or indirectly to the war program.

Although the services have indicated that they might accept legislative controls over IV-F's as a substitute for national service legislation, they have flatly declined thus far to institute the controls themselves.

JOINT STATEMENT ISSUED

In a joint statement, War Secretary Henry L. Stimson, Navy Secretary Frank Knox, and Rear Admiral Emory S. Land, Chairman of the Maritime Commission, declared that service legislation was necessary to insure the success of essential war programs and added:

"Someone must step up to the bench, the lathe, and desk of every warworker who leaves to fight for his country. More than that, the Nation's working forces must be made flexible enough to fill the needs of high priority military production. Disorderly migration of labor must be arrested. The turnover rate in war industries is alarming. We, as a people, are not meeting many of the labor shortages in critical programs, in the midst of a war for survival."

The statement disclosed that they had met with representatives of the chamber of commerce, National Association of Manufacturers and Association of American Railroads to solicit their support of war service legislation. The sharply dissenting statements issued later by the National Association of Manufacturers and chamber of commerce indicated that they did not make much progress. Meetings previously held with labor leaders failed to remove labor's unqualified opposition to national service.

"DISASTROUS," SAYS GAYLORD

Robert M. Gaylord, president of National Association of Manufacturers, stated that application of such a law would be disastrous to production, and added: "Industry knows that the way to get production is to lead men, not to drive them. It wants no part of forced labor."

The chamber of commerce said "imposition of a compulsory law upon the industrial

workers of the Nation would bring complications which actually might retard rather than advance the war program."

The estimated needs of the armed forces for the rest of 1944 included naval requirements (Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard) for 635,000 men, with 230,000 as replacements, and Army replacement needs for 750,000. The Army reached full strength on April 1.

The three agency heads warned that a larger number of men might be required in view of the uncertainties of the impending invasion.

Strong pressure from civilian agencies to prevent the armed services from getting a large part of the needed men from essential industries may be expected. One official argued that draft policies ought to be changed to take young men out of agriculture before taking older men out of industry.

It was pointed out that some basic industries which are not considered critical today, and hence receive no protection from the draft of men under 26, may take on extreme urgency later on, due to a shift in the war program. Then, without necessary skilled men, it may be unable to do the job assigned.

LOT OF MEN OVER 30

It is believed in some quarters that, despite the demands made by the armed services, it may never be necessary to make important inroads into the pool of men over 30 in essential industries, yet the status of this age group remains unclear. On the other hand, it is generally agreed, that a new deferment yardstick will have to be established in the 26-to-30 age group.

Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, gave this picture in an address last night:

"The selection of men for the armed forces in the future will include every possible man under 26 physically fit; the balance must come first from those 26 through 29 with greater consideration for deferment being given to those men in industrial and agricultural activities and who are critically needed by those activities."

"The balance of the men required by the Army and Navy will come from those past 30, particularly those who are engaged in activities that do not contribute in a material way to the winning of the war, or those who, although engaged in such activities, do so in a half-hearted manner."

DRAFT QUOTAS MAY DROP

Allocating the 1,385,000 among the 9 months from April through December indicated that monthly draft calls may drop from the present 175,000 to 200,000 level to 125,000 or lower. However, Hershey, apparently making independent calculations, asserted that it "would be overly optimistic" if less than 150,000 a month is allowed for replacements to maintain the Army at its 7,700,000 full strength and the Navy at the 3,600,000 full strength projected for September 1.

According to the figures released in the Stimson-Knox-Land statement, Army replacement needs are expected to average 83,000 a month over 9 months, while Navy replacement needs are slated to be slightly over 25,000 a month, for a monthly total of 108,000.

On the subject of legislation to control the job movements of IV-F's the Costello report stated:

"It has been brought to the attention of the committee that while the War Department has indicated an unwillingness to adopt and place in effect the recommendations of the committee, nevertheless the authority to do so still remains, and the committee takes the position that until it is pointed out wherein the laws which have already been enacted as a result of the committee's legislative action are shown to be

inadequate, further legislation is not necessary."

SEVEN RECOMMENDATIONS MADE

Specifically, the Costello group made seven recommendations:

1. That reclassification out of IV-F of those in essential activities continue.
2. That Selective Service and War Manpower Commission list industries in which IV-F's may be granted deferments.
3. That IV-F's holding deferments be required to secure the permission of their draft boards before changing jobs.
4. That IV-F's not in essential activities be required to notify their draft boards of willingness to accept essential employment.
5. That IV-F's who are unwilling to accept essential employment be deemed subject to induction into the armed forces.
6. That they be accepted by the armed forces for noncombatant duty.
7. That, if an insufficient amount of manpower is provided by these techniques, the same procedures be applied to those discharged from the armed forces (I-C's) and to all registrants between the ages of 38 and 45.

[From the Washington Post of April 21, 1944]

TEXT OF LABOR DRAFT DEMAND MADE BY STIMSON, KNOX, LAND

The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission announce that they have met today with representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Association of American Railroads to discuss the necessity for national war-service legislation.

Also present and joining in the discussion were Gen. George C. Marshall, Army Chief of Staff; Admiral Ernest J. King, Commander in Chief, United States Fleet and Chief of Naval Operations; Lt. Gen. Brehon H. Somervell; Assistant Secretary of the Navy Ralph A. Bard; Senator Warren R. Austin, of Vermont; and Representative James W. Wadsworth, of New York.

Conferences previously had been had with the national labor leaders.

STATEMENT BY OFFICIALS

Following today's meeting, Secretary Stimson, Secretary Knox, and Admiral Land issued a joint statement describing the need for legislation to provide adequate manpower for essential industries which must increase production despite transfer of some 1,400,000 of their employees to military service. The statement:

After meeting with national leaders of organized labor, we invited representatives of the United States Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, and the Association of American Railroads to meet with us for a discussion of the critical industrial manpower problem and to solicit their support for war-service legislation.

Before the end of the year we estimate that the armed services will require an additional 1,400,000 men. The uncertainties of the invasion may largely increase this total. Most of them—almost all—will be obtained through the democratic processes of the Selective Service System.

Most of them, too, will be drawn from vital industries which must not only obtain replacements for their employees called to the armed services but which must in many instances increase their working forces.

The Nation has summoned 11,000,000 men to the colors. It is the essence of democracy that there should be equality of obligation as well as equality of privilege. If it is logical to require some to fight, then it is equally logical to require others to supply them with weapons. Only war service legislation can insure fair distribution of the burden we must all bear to win the victory in which we all will share.

Such legislation is necessary, in our opinion, to insure the success of essential war programs. Legislation of universal application is not, in our opinion, necessary. What is needed is a law so designed as to meet the actual conditions which confront the Nation and its men on the fighting fronts. What those conditions are shall be stated.

It is imperative that the country realize that the present methods of industrial service cannot do the whole job; that the American people must adopt some system of national industrial service which will provide workers for essential war industries, wherever shortages in manpower appear.

TELL OF PROPOSED ACT

It is our thought that the War Work Service Act should first provide for the recruiting of voluntary industrial workers before the selective service principle is invoked. When a given war industry in a given locality is found suffering from a labor shortage, that fact should be proclaimed in a call for volunteers to fill the shortage.

Emphatically the law must prevent depletion in the ranks of other essential industries to man the one in distress, because one of the greatest of present difficulties is the excessive turn-over in employment. The volunteers must come from labors not necessary to the Nation's war needs.

In case sufficient volunteers do not appear in answer to the call, then the national selective service principle must be invoked to supply the essential need. That is our judgment. It is based on facts such as these:

Before the end of 1944 the Navy, Coast Guard, and Marine Corps will require 635,000 men, of whom 230,000 will be needed as replacements;

In the same time the Army, which has reached its complement, will need 750,000 additional men as replacements;

That is a total of 1,390,000 men, a minimum total which may have to be greatly increased before 1945;

The greatest part of this number will be drawn from the shops and farms and mines, the factories, and the railroads; most will have to be replaced, because essential industries must keep on supplying our fighting forces with the materials and instruments of war;

The aircraft plants and the shipyards must not only be provided replacements for men called into the armed forces but they must be given 200,000 additional workers to supply the demand for planes and ships;

Navy yards will need 5,000 additional workers just for the construction of submarines alone;

In the shipyards building landing craft and all the amphibious warfare vessels, 18,000 workers above all replacements must be found before September. If we do not have the landing craft we cannot take or hold the beaches.

In two east coast yards alone 11,000 men are immediately needed to build tankers to fuel our fleets.

OTHER MANPOWER NEEDS

These are but examples. Plants making synthetic rubber, tire fabrics, and heavy-duty tires must have 19,000 more workers before September. Radio and radar factories are in urgent need now for 30,000 workers, more than 4,000 additional workers are needed in the manufacture of aviation gasoline. And all these are in addition to industrial replacements.

This Nation sacrificed 60 bombers and 600 men to cripple the German ball-bearing industry in Schweinfurt, but it cannot obtain the workers here at home to fill the production lines of our own bearing and foundry industries upon which the armament program depends.

The railroads, upon which the Nation depends for moving troops and the products of

our factories and farms, assert that they are jeopardized by a shortage today of 100,000 men. The coal mines, source of the power that drives the wheels of industry and transportation, will send 45,000 workers into the armed forces this year from an already insufficient crew of miners. The lumber industry calls for 40,000 men at once.

Someone must step up to the bench, the lathe, and desk of every war worker who leaves to fight for his country. More than that, the Nation's working forces must be made flexible enough to fill the needs of high-priority military production. Disorderly migration of labor must be arrested. The turn-over rate in war industries is alarming. We, as a people, are not meeting many of the labor shortages in critical programs, in the midst of a war for survival.

From March 1943 to March 1944 the civilian labor force declined by 1,500,000—equal to the number of men who will be drafted into the armed forces this year. In consequence, the Nation suffers with 67 labor-shortage areas. Nearly every industrial center in the country needs workers. There are enough persons in most of these areas who are idle or employed in unessential work to make up these deficiencies.

Out of every 1,000 workers employed on February 1, 1944, 65 quit. Only 53 workers are recruited to take their places. That means that last February the Nation lost a net of 12 men out of every 1,000. Where 1,000 were turning out the munitions of war on February 1, only 988 were working on February 29.

Labor turn-over has reached a rate of more than 6 percent per month, 3 times the peacetime average.

In short, in order to keep a constant force of 100 men working, an employer had to hire 72 new hands in the course of the year.

Why are they quitting? One reason is that successes in battle result in adverse trends in employment and production. Every victory seems to inspire in thousands the belief that the war is won. False public interpretation of what are only local victories on the perimeter of the enemies' strongholds may indeed imperil victory when we thrust at the foes' heart.

We have yet to meet the major forces of Germany, and of a Japan commanding a large share of the natural wealth and human resources of eastern Asia. We are still 2,000 miles from Tokyo, with all the enemy land and sea and air forces between us and that goal. For our fighting men, the war is just entering its critical stage. For our civilian labor forces, there must be no relaxation of effort.

OUR GREATEST UNDERTAKING

We are poised for our greatest undertaking as a Nation since we achieved our national independence and unity. We dare not falter at the front—or at home. Present methods have not and are not solving our critical manpower problems. There is little evidence to believe that they will provide for the greater problems of the future.

The very real possibility that we may suddenly be forced to shift thousands of workers into the production of some entirely new weapon, which experience in combat or the secret inventions of our enemies demand, is a contingency which we cannot ignore.

In practice a national war-service law would probably affect only a small proportion of the Nation's employables, for most of the shortages are specific, rather than general, and the aggregate numbers needed to meet them are but a fraction of our potential working force.

From the experience of our allies, it can be predicted that once the obligation to serve is made a duty by law the volunteers will come forward. Be that as it may, the need for a law to mobilize and maneuver the industrial manpower of the Nation cannot, in our judgment, be denied or evaded.

Experience has taught us that we must use selective processes to man our fighting forces; experience is now teaching us that we must invoke the same national power to provide them the weapons.

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

FRANK KNOX,
Secretary of the Navy.
EMORY S. LAND,

Chairman, U. S. Maritime Commission.

[From the New York Times of April 21, 1944]

STILL A WAR TO WIN

Three men who know at first hand the resources and the strategy of the armed forces of the United States spoke last night in Times Hall on the theme, "We still have the war to win." They agreed that the unfinished task that lies ahead is still formidable enough to require every ounce of effort and devotion that we as a Nation can put into it. Speaking for the Navy, Rear Admiral Cooke, Deputy Chief of Staff, pointed out that despite our brilliant naval successes in the Pacific we have not yet found a way of "deploying ground forces sufficient to bring to defeat the very strong Japanese ground forces on the battlefields necessary for close blockade and for securing the positions necessary for bombing Japan"; moreover, as we move westward in the Pacific "our lines of communication become longer, the Japanese lines shorter, the Japanese perimeter of defense smaller." Speaking for the Army, Under Secretary of War Patterson urged us to look at the map and face realistically the size of the problems involved in maintaining an uninterrupted flow of munitions to armies stationed at the ends of 56,000 miles of sea lanes. As Director of Selective Service, Major General Hershey declared that while the still undetermined fortunes of war make any precise estimate impossible, we shall be "overly optimistic" if we do not plan on replacement for our armed services at the rate of 1,800,000 a year.

These sober appraisals give us some measure of the task with which we are confronted and warn us again against the dangerous assumption of taking victory for granted. The war is still far from won. It will still be far from won when Allied troops have succeeded in landing on the well-armed coasts of France and when Allied naval forces, venturing far past Sabang and Truk, are prepared to strike at Singapore and the Philippines. We may hope for an earlier end of the fighting on all fronts than the present military situation warrants; but we cannot for a moment afford to base our efforts and our plans on any other assumption than that a long hard struggle lies ahead.

What can the stay-at-home do to help shorten that struggle besides continuing to give his best efforts to any useful task on which he is employed? Secretary Patterson recommends a three-point program for those of us who are on the safer end of the long lines of communications. First, trust in our allies. "The job is too big for us alone. Wholehearted cooperation in our world struggle is a plain necessity." Second, trust our military leadership. "Critics who attack from the comfort of their armchairs individual segments of an over-all complex pattern do damage." Third, leave nothing undone that will help achieve "an inseparable linking of ourselves in thought and action with our fighting men."

This third recommendation points straight toward the enactment of some form of national war-service legislation which will impose upon able-bodied citizens at home, whose efforts are needed on the war-production line, the same legal and moral obligations to help with this war which now rest solely upon young men of draft age. The case for such legislation is presented strongly and, in our judgment, unanswerably, in the statement issued yesterday in Washington by Secretary

Stimson, Secretary Knox, and Admiral Land. The fact that this statement was issued after conferences in which General Marshall and Admiral King participated and in which the whole problem of manpower was reviewed ought to gain for it the immediate attention of Congress, despite the now threadbare comment that "this is an election year."

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MCKELLAR

[Mr. McKellar asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a radio address on the subject of the Tennessee Valley Authority, delivered by him in Knoxville, Tenn., on April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS SERVICE FLAG DEDICATION—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH OF MASSACHUSETTS

[Mr. Walsh of Massachusetts asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him on April 16 on the occasion of the dedication of the national service flag under the auspices of the Knights of Columbus at New Haven, Conn., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR BUTLER AT SECOND ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE N. R. E. C. A.

[Mr. Butler asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address delivered by him on March 7, 1944, at the second annual convention of the N. R. E. C. A. in Chicago, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAN-AMERICAN DAY ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. Connally asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the address delivered by Hon. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, in celebration of Pan-American Day, before the Pan American Union on April 14, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

THOMAS JEFFERSON, A GREAT AMERICAN—ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE JACKSON

[Mr. Wagner asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on Thomas Jefferson, delivered by Associate Justice Jackson of the Supreme Court of the United States before the Virginia State Society, Washington, D. C., April 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

INVASION AND THE FINAL CHALLENGE—EDITORIAL BY MCGRAW-HILL PUBLISHING CO.

[Mr. Wagner asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Invasion and the Final Challenge," prepared by the McGraw-Hill Publishing Co. and published in the Washington Post of Thursday, April 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR BOND PURCHASES BY NINETY-NINTH LONE STAR BATTALION

[Mr. Connally asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record correspondence and a news release relative to the purchase of War bonds by the Ninety-ninth Lone Star Battalion, which appear in the Appendix.]

ISOLATIONISTS, NATIONALISTS, AND INTERNATIONALISTS—EDITORIAL FROM IRON AGE

[Mr. Wheeler asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Strange Words; Queer Bedfellows," published in the Iron Age of April 20, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAM—ARTICLE FROM McCALL'S MAGAZINE

[Mr. Capper asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article on the

school-lunch program, published in McCall's Magazine, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY—EDITORIALS FROM THE BALTIMORE SUN

[Mr. Radcliffe asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record two editorials by John W. Owens, one entitled "The Lag on Russia," published in the Baltimore Sun of April 12, 1944, and the other entitled "On the Loose Again," published in the Baltimore Sun of April 14, 1944, which appear in the Appendix.]

LINCOLN'S PEACE AND OURS—EDITORIAL FROM ILLINOIS STATE REGISTER

[Mr. Lucas asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the Record an editorial entitled "Lincoln's Peace and Ours," published in the Illinois State Register of April 13, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

HEARINGS BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS RELATIVE TO POST-WAR PLANNING

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 80, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2, of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 1,000 additional copies of the hearings held before said committee during the current session relative to post-war planning.

Mr. TRUMAN. The concurrent resolution authorizes the printing of certain hearings before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the House of Representatives, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

HOURS OF DUTY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2928) to amend the act entitled "An act to fix the hours of duty of postal employees, and for other purposes," approved August 14, 1935, as amended, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. McKellar. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKellar, Mr. Bailey, and Mr. Reed conferees on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS COUNCIL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 248) for the relief of Louis Council, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. Ellender. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree

to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

REV. C. M. MCKAY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 544) for the relief of Rev. C. M. McKay, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

DELORES LEWIS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1313) for the relief of Delores Lewis and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. ROBERTSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

EDDIE T. STEWART

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1411) for the relief of Eddie T. Stewart, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILDRED B. HAMPTON

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1412) for the relief of Mildred B. Hampton, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER,

Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EDWARD E. AND MARY JANE HELD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2625) for the relief of Edward E. Held and Mary Jane Held, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. EASTLAND, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

MAVIS NORRINE COTHRON ET AL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3390) for the relief of Mavis Norrine Cothron and the legal guardian of Norma Lee Cothron, Florence Janet Cothron, and Nina Faye Cothron, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. WILSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

REV. JAMES T. DENIGAN

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3538) for the relief of the Reverend James T. Denigan, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. O'DANIEL, and Mr. WHERRY conferees on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT BY SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE PETROLEUM RESOURCES

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President—

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I asked recognition in order that I might move that the Senate take up a bill for consideration, but I shall be glad to yield for routine matters, and I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a statement issued on April 19, 1944, by the Senate Special Committee to Investigate Petroleum Resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Senate Petroleum Resources Committee has held a number of executive sessions in preparation for public hearings which, it is expected, will begin soon after the first of May.

Mr. F. A. Davies, president of the Arabian-American Oil Co., attended the committee's meeting today.

Previously the committee has heard the Secretary of the Interior, Harold L. Ickes, who was accompanied by Ralph K. Davies, Deputy Petroleum Administrator; Commodore A. F. Carter, executive officer of the Army-Navy Petroleum Board; and Col. John H. Leavell and Charles Rayner, of the Department of State.

The representatives of the various governmental departments have exhibited to the committee full cooperation in these preliminary deliberations.

Under its organic resolution, this committee is "authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation with respect to petroleum resources, and the production and consumption of petroleum and petroleum products, both within and outside the United States, in their relation to our national welfare and security."

The committee is further directed upon the basis of its study to make an early report to the Senate "together with its recommendations for the formulation of a national petroleum policy."

The committee does not conceive its initial duty to be to enter upon a detailed collection of statistics on petroleum resources. It is not intended to engage in studies of a factual nature which for practical purposes would duplicate work already completed by other committees of the Senate, agencies of the executive department and various branches of private industry.

This is a policy committee. Its essential function is to make recommendations for the formulation of a national policy in which particularly, in its international aspects, the Senate of the United States has a direct responsibility.

Petroleum has emerged in this war as a natural resource of the highest strategic significance. After the war its use and conservation may be expected to play a dominant role in the maintenance of peace and security among nations and in promoting prosperity among peoples.

These are propositions readily accepted. The more difficult questions relate to methods by which this Nation and other nations are to govern the impact of petroleum upon a world moving out of war and into peace.

The United States is by far the leading nation in producing and consuming petroleum products. The policy it adopts toward the production and distribution of this great natural resource, and its derivatives, is bound to have a profound influence not only upon the domestic economy of the country, but also upon the course we, as a nation, are to pursue in foreign affairs.

Congressional participation in the formulation of this policy is essential, if the policy is to be truly national and an authoritative pronouncement which the people of the country will be prepared to accept and implement.

With the organization of this committee, congressional participation in the formulation of a national petroleum policy has begun. Other departments of the Government have already indicated a readiness to keep the committee fully advised on developments and to assist the committee in its studies and investigations.

It is recognized, in line with Secretary Hull's recent declaration, that the Congress is to be given adequate participation in charting the country's course in foreign affairs.

To the extent that the determination of a national petroleum policy may involve understandings, arrangements, or agreements with other countries, with possible influence on the broad principles of foreign policy, the committee has been assured that the Congress will be fully consulted in advance of final commitments.

In a matter so grave and far reaching in its effect upon the national economy and upon the country's post-war position in world affairs, the Congress has a duty to do more than merely to formalize by legislation a policy previously determined by others. It is for this reason that the committee has undertaken a comprehensive study of the petroleum situation both at home and abroad.

Thus, the work of the committee, even in advance of formal recommendations to the Senate, should aid in bringing to the Congress valuable information upon preliminary deliberations affecting a national petroleum policy.

It is recognized that in the utilization of petroleum products for the immediate purposes of waging war, our military services must act quickly and must adopt temporary measures which cannot await the determination of a long-range plan or policy.

Neither the Senate as a whole, nor this committee, has any intention to interfere with this exclusive responsibility of the Army and Navy. It is always proper, however, to consider whether measures taken for military purposes might also affect the long-range policy on petroleum.

It is the committee's view that the representatives of private industry in petroleum should be asked to join with the Government in the work leading to the formulation of a petroleum policy. We initiate these studies with no preconceived ideas on the restriction of private capital in fields of legitimate enterprise. We believe that on this tremendous post-war problem the country needs the candid and open-minded cooperation of Government and industry working together in the interest of national welfare and security.

It may well be that the principles agreed upon in the formulation of a national petroleum policy, and the technique adopted for integrating the work of Government and industry in this field, will create a pattern for solving the problems related to other natural resources.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES ENGAGED IN COMBAT SERVICE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, on March 16 of this year I introduced a bill, Senate bill 1787, to provide additional pay for members of the armed forces engaged in combat service. The bill provides that "officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services," and so forth, "shall receive an increase of 50 percent of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in actual combat against the enemy or to serve regularly and frequently in immediate combat areas with troops engaged in actual combat against the enemy."

That bill has been referred to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. I find that Representative Weiss, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a similar bill in the House of Representatives. In the Washington Post of this morning appears a Gallup poll undertaking to sound the sentiment of the people of the

country on the proposed legislation. The Gallup poll demonstrates the great preponderance of opinion of the country favoring the passage of my bill, S. 1787.

The passage of the proposed legislation could never result in fully paying for their services the men who engage in actual combat, but it would be a recognition of their service and show that we regard them with esteem and appreciation and that we contemplate with feelings of earnest sympathy the harsh, difficult, and dangerous situations which they necessarily must encounter.

Therefore I bespeak the attention and support of the Members of the Senate to the bill when it comes before the Senate for consideration.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have inserted in the RECORD the Gallup poll, which appears in the Washington Post of April 21, 1944, and also a radio address which I made on April 6 over the Blue Network on the subject of the proposed legislation. As I desire to have the Gallup poll and the radio address printed together in the RECORD, and as a copy of the address will not be available to me in time for printing in today's RECORD, I ask that the poll and address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD of Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

[The poll and address appear in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1922.]

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-THIRD ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield further?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in today's RECORD a letter under date of March 22, 1944, which I wrote to Rev. Daniel Gambrillis, of Chicago, chairman of the committee having in charge the observance of the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence at Ashland Park Auditorium, Chicago, together with a brief speech which I sent to him as a tribute to the Greek people on that anniversary.

There being no objection, the letter and the speech were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 22, 1944.

Rev. DANIEL GAMBRILLIS, Chairman,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR REVEREND GAMBRILLIS: I am grateful to you for your telegram advising me of the forthcoming observance of the one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence at Ashland Park Auditorium.

Your invitation to send a message I appreciate very much.

I rejoice with the Greek communities everywhere on this one hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence and take satisfaction in the historic fact that the United States, although a young Nation itself, was the first nation to recognize the Greek Government. Ever since then we have held Greece in high esteem. Her sons and daughters have enriched our American citizenship.

Feeling as I do, in consonance therewith, I have had the privilege of appointing as principals and alternates to the Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy

at Annapolis the following boys of Greek ancestry: Alexander James Papatones, Somersworth, N. H.; Kaston R. Zablackas, North Conway, N. H.; Louis G. Scilris, Portsmouth, N. H., and Demosthenes Paul Dakos, Manchester, N. H. These young men are demonstrating a high standard of scholarship and character in these schools.

Today Greece is passing through a time of trial, and I join with her people and her friends in earnest prayer for her complete liberation from the thralldom of Axis forces and for a bright and glorious future.

I salute not only the glory that was Greece but the glory that is to be Greece of the future.

Very sincerely,

CHARLES W. TOBEY,

United States Senator from New Hampshire.

In many parts of our Nation, the sons and daughters of Greece are observing this year the one-hundred-and-twenty-third anniversary of Greek independence.

Despite the tragic fact that Greece is suffering today under domination of the Axis Powers, the spirit of the Greek people is unconquerable, and they will, with our help, cast out the invaders and rise to a new epoch of national progress and well-being.

In 1941 I submitted Senate Joint Resolution 45 to the United States Senate, authorizing a loan of \$100,000,000 to the nation of Greece to assist her in her struggles against the Nazi powers. I did it in the full confidence that there was a country that would give a good account of herself against the Axis war machine.

Subsequent events have proved this statement. I like to remember that Greece was the first nation in Europe to follow the American pattern of becoming an independent nation.

With fortitude and courage she revolted in 1821 against the Ottoman Turks, and in the year 1830 won her independence.

Our country, young though it then was, was the first to recognize the Greek Government, and ever since we have held her in our highest esteem and admiration.

That period, during which the Greek Nation rebelled, spelled a turning point for the betterment of all the world's people, because our freedom from England followed by this one, gave courage and hope to the French who rose against Charles X and dethroned him; then to Belgium, which soon gained her independence; and to Poland, which rose against the Czars.

But to the Greeks, from the protocol of London February 3, 1830, and before, and to this very day and hour, have gone the respect of all thinking men for their devotion to the right and for their accomplishments.

During the closing days of the last World War, many maintain, and with good reason I believe, that the presence of the Grecian Army on the Macedonian front made victory possible there. Von Hindenburg himself is said to have admitted that the German collapse on the Macedonian front rendered their chance to force a suitable peace, a hopeless task.

In this present strife, in this war's darkest hour, and while the Nazis still looked unbeatable, little Greece resisted her with all she had and forced Hitler to hesitate. This gained precious time for the British and her allies. Overwhelming were the odds against her but she did not falter. Blood, starvation, destruction, and death have been her portion but stanch and unconquerable has been her courage.

The progress of Greece has been the progress of civilization. Her ancient architecture still rates with the beautiful, the most beautiful. Her sculpture still reigns. The tragedy and comedy of her literature, the poetry and grace of the ancient Grecian dances are still superb but, great as have

been her contributions to the arts and sciences, she has made a more fundamental contribution to the United States in the sons and daughters of Hellas who have come to America and have become a real part of our national life. Thrift, integrity, industry—these are their outstanding attributes and we gladly pay them tribute today.

May the culture, charm, and beauty of all that was ever Greece have a new birth for the glory of the whole world, when this bitter war is won.

TRIBUTE TO DANNY JACKSTADT

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield to me in order that I may read a short editorial into the RECORD?

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, recently I received from Capt. Irving Dilliard, who is with the Allied Expeditionary Force in Italy, a letter and a copy of the Stars and Stripes. In the copy of the Stars and Stripes appears an editorial entitled "Undestroyable." The editorial merely quotes another editorial, written by James O. Monroe, editor of the Collinsville (Ill.) Weekly Herald, which pays tribute to a printer named Danny Jackstadt, formerly employed by Mr. Monroe, who made the supreme sacrifice on the Italian battle front. The tribute is so touching and beautiful that I shall take the time of the Senate to read it into the RECORD. It is as follows:

I am framing Danny Jackstadt's picture and putting it on the wall above the desk where I write. Nearly every time I look up I will see the broad grin of that young printer of ours who a month ago gave his life in Italy to help keep us safe from savagery and let us continue to live our lives as we all lived them together here before Danny went away. And I will smile back at Danny now and then, as I used to do when he was here, and behind my smile there will be a firm determination, as there always was behind Danny's, to live faithfully and well the daily life ahead. And while I shall not be called on to make the sacrifice which he made all in one sudden, sharp, unheralded moment, I am called upon by his smile above me to make every sacrifice of time and effort, every exertion of heart and brain, to be worthy of him, to carry forward the cause for which he lived and fought and died—the cause of a good life in a free world.

Danny was good. To see his picture every day will make me better. And that will help me to help others to make their lives better. And thus, in God's strange way, will Danny's sacrifice weigh in the immortal scales, creating a balance of good in others equal to the good life he himself would have lived if he had been permitted.

It must be that no good is ever lost.

PRODUCTION OF LEGUME AND GRASS SEED

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I sought the floor and secured recognition for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1743. I did so in the absence of the able chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. SMITH], who is now in the Chamber. Therefore, I yield to him.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1743.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1743) to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war food-production program.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me for a question about the bill before action is taken on his motion?

Mr. SMITH. Yes; I yield; but I wish to state that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is the author of the bill, and is thoroughly familiar with it. I suggest that the Senator from Connecticut ask his question of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, before we proceed, I should like to make a statement, if the Senator from South Carolina will yield to me.

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I wish to have the RECORD show that the Red Cross bill, which is the pending business of the Senate, is being only temporarily laid aside for this purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is informed that the Red Cross bill is not the pending business, but that it was merely stated as being the intention of the Senate to make it the pending business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Very well, Mr. President; whatever may be the technical description of the status of the bill, I wish to make it clear that it was the understanding of the leadership upon both sides—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct—

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That the Red Cross bill would be taken up today; and it is now the understanding that it is being temporarily laid aside for reasons which are known to the leadership, namely, the absence of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who desires to be heard upon the matter; and that when the Senate assembles on Monday the Red Cross bill will have the preferred position, whatever technically it may be.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. When does the Senator say the Red Cross bill will be in order to be taken up?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the understanding, I will say to the Senator, that the Senate will take it up at the opening of the session on Monday. It is indicated that the bill in which the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] are so much interested can, without question, be passed without any delay, and that thereafter the Senate will go over until Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, there has been reported from the Appropriations Committee the naval appropriation bill for the ensuing fiscal year, and we are very anxious to have it passed on Monday. Does the Senator think there will be time to pass both bills on Monday?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], who desires to present an amendment to the Red Cross bill, has

assured me that he would be quite willing to have an agreement by which the Senate will vote not later than 2:30 on Monday on the pending matter. So I have no doubt that both bills can be disposed of on Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR. That will give ample time.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to say that the seed bill is very necessary and very urgent. There is difficulty in getting seed for the farmers.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has kindly yielded to me in order that I may put some questions to the Senator from Iowa, who is the author of the proposed legislation.

I notice that section 3 of the bill provides that—

The Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments * * * to producers of seed of grasses and legumes specified in section 2 (a) or designated by the Administrator as war emergency forage crop seed.

Is it the purpose of the Senator that title to the seeds shall pass to the Administrator upon the making of the payments authorized?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; definitely not. The payment is an incentive one, made through the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, just as other payments to producers are made by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency. When the producer has produced the seed, has turned it into consumptive channels, and has complied with the regulations, he is eligible to receive the payment.

Mr. DANAHER. Is any payment to be made to any producer before the seed is in fact introduced to consumptive channels?

Mr. GILLETTE. No; absolutely not.

Mr. DANAHER. Is it the purpose of the Senator actually, therefore, to provide some form of incentive payment which will take account of the great and urgent need for the seed, and which therefore will induce the producer to produce more seed and make it available for ourselves and our allies?

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the whole purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. Has the Senator in mind any quantitative sum which will measure the fair amount of incentive payments so required?

Mr. GILLETTE. In answer to that question, I will say that a subcommittee composed of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], and myself conducted hearings on the proposal. Question arose as to what amount would be necessary. There is at present in the Agricultural Adjustment Act a provision for the payment of \$3.50 an acre, which payments have been made for production of this type. It is not sufficient for the object which is sought, and it is proposed to be supplemented by a provision that for clean seed turned into consumptive channels an additional payment may be made. There are many types of seeds of legumes and grasses, and there is no way to know what amount would be necessary. The Agricultural Adjustment Agency's representatives thought that

approximately \$35,000,000 would be required. It was the opinion of the subcommittee that no such sum would be necessary. On the basis of our best estimates, after conferring with representatives of the War Food Administration and the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, the sum of \$25,000,000 was thought to cover the necessary production. If no seed is produced, no payments will be made.

Mr. DANAHER. Has the Senator canvassed the possibility of establishing a support-price program with reference to each of the seeds to be specified?

Mr. GILLETTE. Very definitely; and the Senator will be interested, I am sure, in a statement made to us by the president of the American Seed Trade Association, Mr. Sexauer, who said:

An increase in the support price will not meet the situation, as this would involve raising ceiling prices, to which the O. P. A. have indicated they would object, as it would also involve raising the ceiling price of hay, and would produce other maladjustments. In addition to this objection, the small marginal producer would not be attracted by a relatively high support price, because of the work and red tape involved in obtaining a loan on a small quantity of seed; and, too, he recalls that the support price does not necessarily mean a corresponding market price, which was the case of corn and wheat a few years ago.

Mr. Sexauer speaks of three definite objections. I may say to the Senator, as a technical matter with which he may be familiar, that in most of these instances the seed is produced from a hay or forage crop. If it is used for hay or forage it is not utilized for seed. The sole purpose is to induce our farmers, who find themselves with increased need for forage and hay, to save a portion of their crop, even if it is only an acre or more, and harvest it for seed, being assured of a fair price.

Mr. DANAHER. My fears have derived from the possibility that the mechanics of this bill might be utilized to evade the Office of Price Administration with reference to its general control of price ceilings in this type of seed. Has any such suspicion crossed the mind of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. GILLETTE. Not at all. I assure the Senator that if any such suspicion had crossed my mind I would not have introduced the bill.

Mr. DANAHER. Let me ask the Senator further whether or not Mr. C. R. Enlow, the gentleman whose name appears in the report, is a Government official?

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes. Mr. Enlow, whose statement was made before the committee, and is embodied in the report, is a representative of the War Food Administration, who appeared before us and made the statement which is printed in the report.

Mr. DANAHER. I find from an examination of the report that there is no indication contained in it that Mr. Enlow procured permission from the Bureau of the Budget to submit a report or make a statement. Is there any reason for that?

Mr. GILLETTE. I cannot answer the question as to whether there was any clearance with the Bureau of the Budget.

If a report has been made to the chairman of the committee, I do not know it.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator from Iowa knows that usually reports contain some such statement.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is true.

Mr. DANAHER. But there is no clearance indicated in this report.

Mr. GILLETTE. Not so far as I am advised.

Mr. DANAHER. I wondered if, in fact, this particular program was in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am confident that it is, in view of the fact that the representatives of every organization which is at all interested in this situation appeared and supported the proposal.

Mr. DANAHER. Did the War Food Administrator concur in the recommendation of Mr. Enlow?

Mr. GILLETTE. He did, through Mr. Enlow, who came at our request to speak for the War Food Administration.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1743) to provide for the adequate production of seed of legumes and grasses required in the war food production program, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this act may be cited as the "War Emergency Forage Seed Act."

SEC. 2. As used in this act—

(a) The term "war emergency forage-crop seed" includes field-crop seeds of alfalfa, red clover, alsike, clover, sweetclover, and ladino, the seed of Sudan grass, crested wheatgrass, brome grass, dallis grass, ryegrass, orchard grass, range grasses, and the seed of such other grasses and legumes as may be designated by the War Food Administrator.

(b) The term "Administrator" means the War Food Administrator appointed pursuant to Executive Order No. 9334, dated April 19, 1943.

SEC. 3. For the purpose of providing for the increased production of seed of grasses and legumes in 1944 essential to the success of the war food program, the Administrator is authorized and directed to make payments through the Agricultural Adjustment Agency, within the limits of appropriations made therefor pursuant to section 6 of this act, to producers of seed of grasses and legumes specified in section 2 (a) or designated by the Administrator as war emergency forage-crop seed. Such payments shall be made on an acreage basis and cleaned-seed basis and shall be paid in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined by the Administrator to be necessary to encourage the retention and harvest of war emergency forage-crop seed and the movement of this seed into consumption channels for planting in 1945.

SEC. 4. (a) Any duties devolving upon the Administrator by virtue of the provisions of this act may with like force and effect be executed by the Agricultural Adjustment Agency or such officers, agents, or employees of the War Food Administration or the Department of Agriculture as the Administrator may designate for such purpose.

(b) The Administrator is authorized and directed to promulgate such rules and reg-

ulations as he may deem necessary for the administration of this act.

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of this act, the Administrator is authorized to cooperate with any other department or agency of the Government, with any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, or any department, agency, or subdivision thereof, and with any domestic producing, trading, or consuming organization: *Provided, however,* That such cooperation be limited to encouraging and securing the production of war emergency forage seed.

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed \$25,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

(b) The Administrator is authorized to make expenditures in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, for necessary expenses, including rent and personal services, of the administration of this act, from funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization contained in subsection (a) of this section, not to exceed the sum of \$5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACTION BY LEGISLATURE OF WYOMING TO ENABLE MEMBERS OF THE ARMED SERVICES TO VOTE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, in connection with the soldiers'-vote law, I wish to report to the Senate that the Legislature of the State of Wyoming was called into special session by the Governor on Monday, April 17, 1944, and passed a bill which enables qualified voters of the State of Wyoming, serving with, or attached to, the armed forces of the United States, to cast their ballots at the general election of 1944.

The law provides that the date of the primary election shall be advanced from August 22, 1944, to July 18, 1944. The law also provides that registration prior to receiving the ballot shall not be required. The law further provides for personal requests for ballots by service men and women, but specifies that, regardless of requests, the county clerks shall, not later than August 20, 1944, mail ballots to all qualified electors in the armed services as shown by available records.

Out of a total population of about 230,000, the State of Wyoming has approximately 24,000 men and women serving with the armed forces.

The law also provides that service men and women shall use the same ballot or ballots given to other electors for general county, State, and National elections. It does not authorize the use of a supplementary short Federal ballot.

I think it will interest the Senate to know that only 13 hours elapsed from the time the legislature was convened until the bill was passed unanimously by both the house and the senate, signed by the Governor, and the legislature adjourned.

AMERICA'S FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Mr. President, it has been frequently charged that America has no foreign policy. That charge has been under discussion in the House of Representatives for several weeks. It has been the subject of commentators and magazine editors. The State Department and the President have taken notice of it. Some Members of Congress

have been invited in for discussion. On Sunday evening, April 9, the Secretary of State made an extended radio speech in explanation of this policy.

In that speech Mr. Hull said:

This is not a mysterious game and our foreign policy must be simple and direct.

I agree that it is not a mysterious game, but is it simple, and is it direct?

He based his speech upon three propositions:

First, since the outbreak of the present war we and our allies have moved from real weakness to strength.

Second, during that same period we have moved from a deep-seated tendency toward separate action to the knowledge and conviction that only through unity of action can there be achieved the results which are essential for the continuance of free people.

Third, we have moved from a careless tolerance of evil institutions to the conviction that free governments and Nazi and Fascist Governments cannot exist together in this world.

I shall not undertake to discuss the soundness of his premise because in an analysis of the charge that we have no foreign policy it is not necessary either to agree or disagree with his statements just quoted.

Foreign policy is established by public pronouncements from the President or the Department of State. Therefore, in a discussion of the charge it is necessary that we examine the speeches and writings of those two officials.

I have the highest personal regard for our distinguished Secretary of State. I respect his ability and his great service to our country. In analyzing his speech or the public statements of the President I shall refer to them only for the purpose of analyzing the charge under discussion, and not for the purpose of criticizing or condemning the course of action indicated therein.

Mr. Hull says that our determination to arm ourselves for a strong self-defense was "a major decision of foreign policy." It may well be asked why it was not just as important in 1933 as in 1938.

The 1932 platform of the Democratic Party condemned the Republican Party for spending money for increased naval armament. Not until 1938 were increased appropriations for defense asked for by the President.

Whether a complete reversal of policy from that of pacifism to one of sound national defense was a major decision of foreign policy, is subject to our several interpretations. To me, it was a major decision because it was a right-about face.

But let us review briefly the President's policy prior to 1938.

On May 7, 1933, Mr. Roosevelt said:

We are seeking a general reduction of armaments and through this the removal of the fear of invasion and armed attack.

On May 16, 1933, he said:

The World Economic Conference will meet soon and must come to its conclusions quickly. The ultimate objective of the Disarmament Conference must be the complete elimination of all offensive weapons.

It is high time for us and for every other nation to understand the simple fact that the invasion of any nation or the destruc-

tion of a national sovereignty can be prevented only by the complete elimination of the weapons that make such a course possible today. Such an elimination will make the little nation relatively more secure against the great nation.

On December 28, 1933, the President said:

The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention. We are not members (of the League of Nations) and we do not contemplate membership. I have said to every nation in the world something to this effect: Let every nation agree to eliminate over a short period of years and by progressive steps every weapon of offense that it has in its possession and create no additional methods of offense.

On January 3, 1934, the President said:

I have made it clear that the United States cannot take part in political arrangements in Europe.

On March 27, 1934, he said:

It has been and will be the policy of the administration to favor continued limitation of naval armaments. It is my personal hope that the Naval Conference to be held in 1934 will extend existing limitations and agree to further reductions.

On October 7, 1935, he said:

It is not surprising that many of our citizens feel a deep sense of apprehension lest some of the nations of the world repeat the folly of 20 years ago and drag civilization to a level from which world-wide recovery may be all but impossible.

In the face of this apprehension the American people can have but one concern—despite what happens in continents overseas, the United States of America shall and must remain unentangled and free. We not only earnestly desire peace, but we are moved by a strong determination to avoid those perils that will endanger our peace with the world.

It is true that other nations may, as they do, enforce contrary rules of conscience and conduct. It is true that other policies may be pursued under flags other than our own, but those policies are beyond our jurisdiction. As President of the United States, I say to you most earnestly once more that the people of America and the Government of those people intend and expect to remain at peace with all the world.

On October 17, 1935, the President said:

I have pledged myself to do my part in keeping America free of those entanglements that move us along the road to war.

In a letter written to Hon. Norman Davis, dated October 5, 1934, the President said:

The abandonment of these treaties (referring to the limitation of arms treaties with Great Britain and Japan) would throw the principle of real security wholly out of balance. I ask you, therefore, to propose to the British and Japanese a substantial proportional reduction in the present naval levels. I suggest a total tonnage reduction of 20 percent below existing treaty tonnage. The United States must adhere to the high purpose of progressive reduction.

I am compelled to make one other point clear. I cannot approve, nor would I be willing to submit to the Senate of the United States, any new treaty calling for larger navies. Governments impelled by common sense and the good of humanity ought to seek treaties reducing armaments; they have no right to seek treaties increasing armaments.

Excessive armaments are in themselves conducive to those fears and suspicions which

breed war. Competition in armament is a still greater menace. The world would rightly reproach Great Britain, Japan, and the United States if we moved against the current of progressive thought. We three nations, the principal naval powers, have nothing to fear from one another. The important matter to keep constantly before our eyes is the principle of reduction.

On January 3, 1936, the President said:

The policy of the United States has been clear and consistent. The United States is following a twofold neutrality toward all and all nations which engage in wars that are not of immediate concern to America. First, we decline to encourage the prosecution of war by permitting belligerents to obtain arms, ammunition, or implements of war from the United States. Second, we seek to discourage the use by belligerent nations of any and all American products calculated to facilitate the prosecution of a war in quantities over and above our normal exports of them in time of peace.

Shipment of steel, scrap iron, and gasoline to Japan was not prohibited until August 1940.

In the same message of January 3, 1936, the President said:

I realize that I have emphasized to you the gravity of the situation which confronts the people of the world. Peace is threatened by those who seek selfish power. This administration, as you know, stands for adequate national defense. When we say adequate defense we mean just that. We are maintaining a system that will meet our defensive needs. We have no plans for any other kind of system.

Continuing, the President said:

As I have said, we seem to understand very well what the problems of the world are. We have, perhaps, a kind of sympathy for their problems. We want to help them all we can; but they have understood very well in these latter years that that help is going to be confined to moral help, and that we are not going to get tangled up with their troubles in days to come.

On August 14, 1936, the President said:

We shun political commitments which might entangle us in foreign war; we avoid connection with the political activities of the League of Nations.

We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war.

In the same speech the President discussed neutrality as part of our foreign policy. He said:

The Congress of the United States have given me certain authority to provide safeguards of American neutrality in case of war. The President of the United States, who, under our Constitution, is vested with primary authority to conduct our international relations, thus has been given new weapons with which to maintain our neutrality. Nevertheless, and I speak from a long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

On August 31, 1935, when he signed the Neutrality Act, the President said:

I have given my approval to the neutrality legislation which passed the Congress last week. I have approved this joint resolution because it was intended as an expression of the fixed desire of the Government and the people of the United States to avoid any action which might involve us in war. The purpose is wholly excellent, and this joint

resolution will to a considerable degree serve that end. The policy of the Government is definitely committed to the maintenance of peace and the avoidance of any entanglements which would lead us into conflict.

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fools' gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans to realize the inevitable penalties.

We can keep out of war if those who watch and decide have a sufficiently detailed understanding of international affairs to make certain that the small decisions of each day do not lead toward war and if, at the same time, they possess the courage to say "no" to those who selfishly or unwisely would let us go to war.

On April 2, 1937, when his attention was called to the fact that we were sending \$50,000,000 worth of steel a month to Great Britain, the President said:

It is an amazing thing for us to be sending forty or fifty million dollars' worth of steel per month to Europe.

By the fall of that year we saw a change in his thinking. October 5, 1937, in Chicago he said:

If we are to have a world in which we can breathe freely and live in amity without fear—the peace-loving nations must make a concerted effort to uphold laws and principles on which alone peace can rest secure.

But in the same speech he further said:

How happy we are that the circumstances of the moment permit us to put our money in bridges, boulevards, dams, and reforestation, the conservation of soil and many other kinds of useful works rather than into huge standing armies and vast supplies of implements of war.

In the same speech he also said:

It seems to be unfortunately true that the epidemic of world lawlessness is spreading. When an epidemic of physical disease starts to spread the community approves and joins in a quarantine of the patients in order to protect the health of the community against the spread of the disease.

In a press conference following the Chicago speech the President was interviewed. He was asked this question:

Is there a likelihood there will be a conference of the peace-loving nations?

The President. No; conferences are out of the window. We never get anywhere with a conference.

Question. Foreign papers put it as an attitude without a program.

The President. That was the London Times.

Question. Wouldn't it be almost inevitable if any program is reached that our present neutrality act will have to be overhauled?

The President. Not in any way.

In his annual message January 23, 1938, the President made this statement:

We, as a peaceful nation, cannot and will not abandon active search for an agreement among the nations to limit armament and end aggression, but it is clear until such decision is reached we are compelled to think of our own national safety.

On July 14, 1938, almost a year after the quarantine speech at Chicago, he had this to say about armaments:

Money spent on armament does not create permanent income-producing wealth, and

about the only satisfaction we can take out of the present world situation is that the proportion of our national income that we spend on armaments is only a quarter or a third of the proportion that most of the other great nations of the world are spending.

November 5, 1938, the President was asked this question in regard to arming this country:

Mr. President, are you considering the possibility of it being necessary to build a fleet large enough to defend both the Atlantic and Pacific coasts at the same time?

The President. No.

In his annual message January 12, 1939, the President said:

It is equally sensational and untrue to take the position that we must at once spend billions of additional money for building up our land, sea, and air forces on the one hand, or to insist that no further additions are necessary on the other.

Calling attention to these facts does not remotely intimate that the Congress or the President have any thought of taking part in another war on European soil.

In a press conference on February 3, 1939, he summed up his foreign policy in this way:

Well, let us do a little analyzing for the benefit of some people. In the first place, the foreign policy of the United States has been thoroughly covered in my messages to Congress, completely and adequately covered in every way. There is nothing new about it. A great many people, some members of the House, some Members of the Senate, and quite a number of newspaper owners are deliberately putting before the American people a deliberate misrepresentation of facts.

The foreign policy has not been changed and it is not going to change. If you want a comparatively simple statement of the policy, I will give it to you.

No. 1. We are against any entangling alliances, obviously.

No. 2. We are in favor of the maintenance of the world trade for everybody, all nations, including ourselves.

No. 3. We are in complete sympathy with any and every effort made to reduce or limit armaments.

No. 4. As a nation, as American people, we are sympathetic with the peaceful maintenance of political, economic, and social independence of all nations in the world.

Now, that is very, very simple. There is absolutely nothing new in it.

September 1, 1939, Germany invaded Poland. Two days thereafter the President, in a public speech by radio, said:

Let no man or woman thoughtlessly or falsely talk of America sending its armies to European fields. This Nation will remain a neutral nation.

But on September 21 he urged the repeal of the Neutrality Act. At that time he said:

Let no man or group in any walk of life assume an exclusive protectorate over the future well-being of America, because I conceive that, regardless of party or section, the mantle of peace and patriotism is wide enough to cover us all. Let no group assume the exclusive label of the "peace bloc." We all belong to it.

I ask that the Neutrality Act be repealed. I regret that Congress passed it. I regret equally that I signed it. It is dangerous, in my opinion, to American security and, above all, American peace.

These embargo provisions, as they exist today, prevent the sale to a belligerent by an American factory of any completed implements of war, but they allow the sale of many

types of uncompleted implements of war, as well as all kinds of general materials and supplies. They, furthermore, allow such products of industry and agriculture to be taken in American ships to belligerent nations. There in itself, under the present law, lies a definite danger to our neutrality and our peace.

From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we can give employment to thousands by doing it here?

It has been erroneously said that return to that policy might bring us nearer to war. I give you my deep and unalterable conviction, based on years of experience as a worker in the field of international peace, that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today.

On April 4, in a letter to Dr. Mary E. Woolley, the President said:

It has been the continuous policy of this Government for many years to cooperate in the world-wide technical and humanitarian activities of the League of Nations without in any way becoming involved in the political affairs of Europe.

A TWO-OCEAN NAVY

In discussing the question of a larger navy, the President on May 14, 1940, only 18 months before Pearl Harbor, said:

A two-ocean navy is an entirely outmoded conception of naval defense, and it has been since about 1847. I just never discuss a two-ocean navy in one way or the other, because it is not sensible to talk of naval defense in those terms.

It really is an outworn conception that nobody who knows anything about defense would ever use. Such a conception [of two-ocean navy] of the Nation's floating defense was just plain dumb.

In a campaign speech made October 24, 1940, at Madison Square Garden, in New York, he said:

We made it clear that ships flying the American flag could not carry munitions to a belligerent and that they must stay out of war zones.

Six days later, in the city of Boston, October 30, 1940, in a campaign address, the President said:

Our objective is to keep any potential attacker as far from our continental shores as we possibly can.

And while I am talking to you mothers and fathers I give you one more assurance. I have said this before, but I shall say it again, again, and again:

"Your boys are not going to be sent into any foreign wars. They are going into training to form a force so strong that, by its very existence, it will keep the threat of war far away from our shores."

At Buffalo November 2, 1940, he said:

Your President says this country is not going to war.

In Cleveland, Ohio, the same day he said:

There is nothing secret about our foreign policy. It is not a secret from the American people and it is not a secret from any government anywhere in the world. I have stated it many times before. Let me restate it like this:

The first purpose of our foreign policy is to keep our country out of war. At the same time we seek to keep foreign conceptions of government out of the United States. That is why we make ourselves strong.

The second purpose of this policy is to keep war as far away as possible from the shores

of the Western Hemisphere. Finally our policy is to give all possible material aid to the nations which will resist aggression across the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

In describing his foreign policy in connection with extending aid to Great Britain he said:

We may come to it, I don't know—and that is a gift; in other words, for us to pay for all these munitions, ships, plants, guns, etc., and make a gift of them to Great Britain. I am not at all sure that that is a necessity, and I am not at all sure that Great Britain would care to have a gift from the taxpayers of the United States.

What I am trying to do is to eliminate the dollar sign. That is something brand new in the thoughts of practically everybody—get rid of the silly, foolish old dollar sign.

The President was then questioned by representatives of the press.

Question. The question I have is whether you think this takes us any more into the war than we are?

The PRESIDENT. No; not a bit.

Question. As long as this is being made to our account and we are lending it to Great Britain, would we deliver the goods in Great Britain that are going to be used in that way?

The PRESIDENT. Oh, I suppose it would depend on what flag was flying at the stern of the ship.

Question. Would it be an American flag?

The PRESIDENT. Not necessarily. That would bring up another subject; that would bring up a subject which might be a dangerous one, quite frankly, of American sailors and American passengers taking the American flag into a war zone. You need not worry about that one bit, because you don't have to send an American flag and an American crew on an American vessel.

On December 29, 1940, the President said:

The people of Europe who are defending themselves do not ask us to do their fighting. They ask us for the implements of war, the planes, the tanks, the guns, the freighters which will enable them to fight for their liberty and for our security.

There is no demand for sending an American Expeditionary Force outside our own borders. There is no intention by any member of your Government to send such a force. You can, therefore, nail any talk about sending armies to Europe as deliberate untruth.

On January 6, 1941, he said:

By an impressive expression of the public will without regard to partisanship we are committed to full support of all those resolute peoples everywhere who are resisting aggression and are thereby keeping war away from our hemisphere. Our role is to act as an arsenal. They do not need manpower. They do need billions of dollars worth of the weapons of defense.

On February 25, 1941, the President stated there was no danger of our running short of rubber. On January 5, 1942, all rubber was frozen and rationed because of the shortage of rubber.

March 5, 1941, he said the lend-lease policy was not a war policy, but the contrary.

On July 24, 1941, the President said:

Here on the east coast, you have been reading that the Secretary of the Interior, as Oil Administrator, is faced with the problem of not enough gasoline to go around on the east coast, and how he is asking everybody to curtail their consumption of gasoline. It was essential for Great Britain that we try

to keep the peace down there in the South Pacific by furnishing gas to Japan.

There was a method in letting this oil go to Japan for the good of the defense of Great Britain and the freedom of the seas.

Five days later, July 29, 1941, at a press conference, he refused to comment on British Prime Minister Churchill's assertion that the United States was moving to the verge of war.

On August 16, 1941, when returning from his conference with Winston Churchill he said that he and Churchill had reached a complete understanding on all aspects of the war situation. Although stating in answer to a question that the United States was no nearer to war than when he departed, the President left no doubt that his return signaled the opening of a new era of anti-German collaboration to achieve the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny.

The historic Atlantic Charter, written and signed at sea on August 14, 1941, by Roosevelt and Churchill, provided as follows:

First. Their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other.

Second. They desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned.

Third. They respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them.

Fourth. They will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity.

Fifth. They desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security.

Sixth. After the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want.

Seventh. Such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance.

Eighth. They believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

What did Cordell Hull say about the Atlantic Charter policy? On April 9 he said:

In Italy our interests are in assisting in the development at the earliest possible moment of a free and democratic Italian Government. As I said some months ago, we have learned that there cannot be any compromise with fascism—whether in Italy or in any other country. It must always be the enemy and

it must be our determined policy to do all in our power to end it.

Within these limits it is not our purpose or policy to impose the ultimate form or personnel of government. Here again we wish to give every opportunity for a free expression of a free Italy.

Then the Secretary proceeded to say that the declaration regarding Italy made at Moscow by the British, Soviet, and American Governments confirmed the policy initiated by the British and American Governments that the Italian Government shall be made more democratic by the introduction of representatives of those sections of the Italian people who have always opposed fascism; that all institutions and organizations created by the Fascist regime shall be suppressed; all Fascist or pro-Fascist elements shall be removed from the administration and from the institutions or organizations of a public character; and that democratic organs of local governments shall be created.

Just how the Secretary is able to justify his statement with the Atlantic Charter is beyond my comprehension. It reminds me of an old farmer in my State who said to his daughter, who was very much in love and wanted to marry a neighbor's son, "Daughter, I don't want to interfere with your decision in marriage and you are entirely free to choose your own husband just so long as you marry Tom Jones."

In other words, the Secretary construes the Atlantic Charter for Italy to mean that the Italian people can have any kind of a government they want just so long as they take the kind the Secretary of State and the President say they may have.

It is possible that the Italian people may decide they want a king. Is it our place to tell them they cannot have a king or any other kind of government they may choose? Is that our purpose in this war? Are we going to thrust down the throats of all the people in this world the kind of government, including personnel, which Mr. Hull and Mr. Roosevelt decide is best for them? Is that what our 10,000,000 American boys are fighting for? Or did Mr. Hull mean something else? If he did not, where does it leave Mr. Roosevelt with his platitude of self-determination for all people?

On February 12, 1943, Mr. Roosevelt expressed himself emphatically upon his position. He said:

It is one of our war aims as expressed in the Atlantic Charter that the conquered populations of today, the overrun countries, shall again become the master of their destiny. There must be no doubt anywhere that it is the unalterable purpose of the United Nations to restore to the conquered people their sacred rights.

Has Mr. Roosevelt changed his position?

Sacred rights of the people of Italy, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, and Finland should and do mean the same thing as sacred rights for the American people. Our sacred rights are those set forth in the Constitution of the United States. How then can the people of these small countries be given their sacred rights, or rather be protected in them, if we are

going to force them to accept the kind of government we decide is best for them and to force them to accept the personnel we approve? If that be foreign policy, then it seems to me there should be a restatement of the whole situation.

On April 9, Mr. Hull said:

We are at all times ready to further an understanding and settlement of questions which may arise between our allies as is exemplified by our offer to be of such service to Poland and the Soviet Union. Our policy is the fundamental necessity of agreed action and the prevention of disunity among us.

Why should we offer to arbitrate the rights of Poland, a free nation? It is entitled to complete independence if the President meant what he said. The rape of Poland is indefensible under any code of morals or law.

In his speech, the Secretary made this statement:

As I look at the map of Europe certain things seem clear to me. As the Nazis go down to defeat they will inevitably leave behind them in Germany and the satellite states of southeastern Europe a legacy of confusion. It is essential that we and our allies establish the controls necessary to bring order out of this chaos as rapidly as possible and to do everything possible to prevent its spread to the German occupied countries of eastern and western Europe while they are in the throes of reestablishing government and repairing the most brutal ravages of the war.

In this hope, Senators, every American joins. But establishment of controls for the safety and security of the people of those particular countries themselves, as well as the rest of the world, is the job of the armed forces. The Army is trained for that work, and is now in charge of planning and executing the moves needed to win this war. They have our complete confidence. It is only when political controls are proposed to be substituted for military controls that we have cause for concern. What kind of control does Mr. Hull mean?

He speaks repeatedly of the destruction of fascism and of the creation of institutions of a free and democratic way of life. That is our way of life. That is the type of government we hope to maintain. But other nations may not want our kind of government. We cannot proclaim that all people will have the choice of the kind of government and the kind of administrators they desire without interference from us, and at the same time force them to accept our particular kind of government.

If the Italian people or the other peoples involved in this world-wide struggle prefer a king or an emperor or a dictator or a military government, why should we insist that they accept our kind of government?

But Secretary Hull said:

It is important to our national interest to encourage the establishment in Europe of strong progressive popular governments, dedicated like our own to improving the social welfare of the people as a whole—governments which will join the common effort of nations in creating the conditions of lasting peace, and in promoting the expansion of production, employment, and the exchange of consumption of goods which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples.

Again one may agree with the Secretary, but I question the advisability of notifying the world that all nations will be free, and then telling them they must accept the kind of freedom we give them.

We have a situation in Italy which by no stretch of the imagination can be called satisfactory.

One of our allies, Soviet Russia, has recognized General Badoglio as the head of the existing government. The existing government is a monarchy.

Are we going to say to Italy in defiance of Mr. Stalin that we will not recognize General Badoglio; that we will not recognize King Emanuel, but will insist that the Italian people discard the monarchy and establish the kind of government we want them to have?

Again Mr. Hull said:

What I have said relates to some of the most immediate of our problems. There remain the more far-reaching relations between us and our allies in dealing with our enemies and in providing for future peace, freedom from aggression, and opportunity for expanding material well-being.

I would only mislead you if I spoke of definite solutions. These require the slow, hard process, essential to enduring and accepted solutions among free people, of full discussion with our allies and among our own people.

While everyone is in accord with Mr. Hull in that statement, what evidence have we that there will be a full and free discussion among our own people and what are the proposals? None have been presented to us for discussion up to this date.

The President has held conferences at Casablanca, Cairo, Teheran, and Quebec. As yet we know nothing about them. No proposals have been disclosed for our discussion. The famous Moscow agreement between Great Britain, Russia, and ourselves was scarcely returned to the respective governments before divergent viewpoints appeared. Mr. Hull told us that the Moscow agreement meant the end of alliances, of spheres of influence, of balances of power. Differing sharply with that interpretation, to Russia it meant no central European federation, no artificial union of power, no cordon of small states at their western boundaries. Then Great Britain said it meant to her the restoration of the balance of power. The life of England depended upon it. Thus we have a different interpretation by each of the Three Powers signing the agreement.

Which interpretation will prevail?

The Atlantic Charter, prepared by Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill, is not a foreign policy any more than the Golden Rule is a foreign policy, or the Sermon on the Mount.

Mr. Hull said that we are determined upon a world organization for cooperative action for peace. We agree in principle. But I have received at least a thousand plans for world organization during the last year and a half. What plan does the President propose? Let the Secretary specify the kind of world organization he has in mind. Let him describe the framework of such an organization so that we can discuss it among ourselves, and thus together work

out a real foreign policy, instead of one of generalities, vagueness, uncertainty, and changing views, which swing as quickly as a weather vane swings to every breeze. We have moved from a policy of complete freedom and independence for all nations to one in which we propose to dictate their form of government and their domestic policies. If that be Mr. Hull's and the President's foreign policy, I am sure the people of America will want to discuss it.

The brilliant senior Senator from the State of Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] forcefully and courageously said in a recent speech:

As I have said before, I concur in our own State Department's plea that this is no time—until we have won the war—to start the reallocation of innumerable controversial boundary lines. But if it is not time for us to do so, then it is no time for others to do so either, and I know of no reason why our Government should not persistently and relentlessly say as much. It is a poor rule which does not restrain all the United Nations alike and in equal measure or which, by the same token, does not permit as great a candor in Washington as is enjoyed in Moscow.

It is now stated openly that the Soviet Union intends to claim all or many of the little countries along its western border, including Poland; and we have tacitly approved and agreed to that grab.

But Mr. Hull objects to a public discussion by Congress or the people. He said:

A proposal is worse than useless if it is not acceptable to those nations who must share with us the responsibility for its execution. It is dangerous for us and misleading to them if in the final outcome it does not have the necessary support in this country. It is, therefore, necessary both abroad and at home not to proceed by presenting elaborate proposals, which only produce divergence of opinion upon details, many of which may be immaterial.

Does Mr. Hull mean that commitments, agreements, or proposals he may make with foreign countries must be completed in every detail before we know what they are? That is not the way a representative government is operated. Only after the fullest public discussion of all proposals, plus Senate approval, can action by our Government be considered final. Our present practice of secret discussion and agreements is a confession of lack of faith in the people. It is the reason for the present storm of criticism against the State Department and the President. The people are not, as one prominent official is credited with saying, "Too damn dumb to understand." They want to help. They want to cooperate, but how can they do either if they know nothing about it?

When Mr. Hull says he cannot speak of plans publicly at the present time because of fear of dissension and lack of agreement, he is not entirely fair with the Senate or with the people, because these discussions have been going on for 2 years between the State Department and the governments of other countries. We know nothing about them. No details have been submitted to the people or to the Senate. Apparently, we will know nothing about them until the last "I" is

dotted and the last "t" is crossed. Cooperation within our Government is just as important as with other nations.

In his report Mr. Hull said:

However difficult the road may be, there is no hope of turning victory into enduring peace unless the real interest of this country, the British Commonwealth, the Soviet Union, and China are harmonized and unless they agree to work together. This is the solid framework upon which all future policy and international organization must be built.

In effect, the Secretary's proposal is for a wheel within a wheel. We will have an organization of United Nations, but within that organization we will have a controlling one composed of the four principal powers. That will bring friction, disunity, and suspicion. It may bring war. Such a plan will not work. All nations must work together with an equal voice in our cooperative efforts.

The Secretary proposes that we have an organization wherein the member nations will solemnly bind themselves and agree not to use force against each other or against any other nation, except in accordance with the arrangements made by the United Nations organization.

With this, adequate forces for peace are proposed. But what are the proposals? Is it to be a world government, with a president and a congress? Which nations are to furnish the men and equipment for this United Nations force? How is it to be maintained? How is it to be selected? Will the personnel be drafted? And after all these matters are arranged, who then will have the power to call out this power to enforce its orders? Do Senators think that either Russia, Great Britain, or the United States will agree to an international force so large and powerful that it can overcome the defensive forces of any of those nations in case of a difference of opinion?

These and many other questions come to one's mind in discussing this most important feature of international relationship.

Then Mr. Hull says:

We are at a stage when much of the work of formulating plans for the organization to maintain peace has been accomplished.

Think of that! And we know nothing whatsoever about it. Congress has not been advised of the steps agreed upon. The people have not been told. Only by indirection do we learn that these steps are being taken—such as the food conference of a year ago only recently released, or the conference now being held in London. Adolph Berle, Assistant Secretary of State, took with him complete plans to this conference for an agreement upon international aviation with the British Government. We in Congress have not been told what these completed plans are, or what is proposed to be done, nor have the American people been informed. Only the brief statement that Mr. Berle, representing the State Department, has arrived in London with plans prepared for him by an interdepartmental committee in Washington has been disclosed.

The announcement by Secretary Hull that he had requested the chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Rela-

tions to designate a bipartisan group to consult and advise the State Department on foreign policies is admirable. Nearly everyone approves such procedure, but let it be understood that the participation by one or two Members of the Senate does not imply the consent and approval of the Senate or of the people.

Then Mr. Hull offers this:

Much of all this will miss its mark of satisfying human needs unless we take agreed action for the improvement of labor standards and standards of health and nutrition.

This sounds very much like the world planners' dreams of giving us a completely socialized world in which the wealth and the production of the American people is to be used to finance the world-wide planners. But how can the American people discuss the wisdom or unsoundness of the plan unless we are told what it is?

The Secretary closes his remarks with this statement:

Our foreign policy is comprehensive, is stable, and is known of all men.

But is it? Outside the administration, no man knows. Editors and radio commentators charge that the foreign policy of the President and the State Department is neither comprehensive or stable or known, and the record sustains the charges.

Joseph N. Jones, for 5 years economic and financial expert of the State Department, said:

The State Department is run by men without faith in the people.

Much of Mr. Hull's speech we approve, but as a statement of a foreign policy he left much unsaid. We are no wiser today than before the speech was delivered and we are completely mystified and confused as to the real objective of this administration.

The Atlantic Charter has been thrown out the window.

Approval of the land-grab by Russia has been given. Apparently, we are expected to recover Hong Kong and Singapore for Britain and the Dutch East Indies for the Netherlands, but what about the many important questions which should be discussed by the American people and by the Congress?

What does the President propose to do about Spain? The present Spanish Government was founded upon bloodshed, revolution, and barbarity. It was established with the aid of Hitler and Mussolini and is still furnishing Germany with supplies, and at the same time is receiving supplies from our country.

Italy is ruled by King Victor Emanuel. He and his father have been in power since the days of Garibaldi. Is the King to be thrown out, or is he to be retained without decision by the Italian people?

The Dutch East Indies never heard of self-determination. They have been exploited for generations by the Dutch. Are those islands to be recaptured by us and returned to the Dutch without regard to the people?

In India millions of citizens have no voice in their Government. Is self-determination to be ignored there? We cannot insist upon one rule for some na-

tions and ignore it for others—or can we?

In France, proverbially our friend, we find the government destroyed by traitors from within as well as enemies from without. A self-appointed committee of Frenchmen now claim they represent France, while an army of Frenchmen equipped by the United States is at bitter odds with the committee.

In China, Chiang Kai-shek has control over three or four provinces only in that huge area. Does he represent the people of China? Is he the government with whom we are to deal as the free selection of the Chinese people after the war?

Palestine is part of modern Arabia and is under British mandate. Many Jewish people want to make their homes there, but Britain has denied them admittance. Are we going to support England, or Arabia, or the people?

In Finland, whose courageous people we have respected and honored for more than a quarter of a century, we see a definite indication that Russia intends to absorb a part or all of that little country.

From Poland hundreds of thousands of her people have come to us as welcome citizens. She was invaded, without fault on her own part. Defeated and crushed, she still fights on. Russia states that she intends to keep Poland.

Mr. President, all these and many other problems are pressing for discussion and for eventual solution.

I agree with Mr. Hull that boundaries cannot be discussed now; that there is only one supreme issue before us today, and that is to win the war, but each and everyone of these problems will be facing us within a matter of months and they are problems that must be met and not evaded or settled by secret conferences.

Mr. Hull, representing the President, proposes a world organization with a police force strong enough to carry out its orders. We must ask ourselves certain questions which are essential to the final determination of this war.

Russia has a population of about 200,000,000. The British Commonwealth of Nations has about 500,000,000 people. China has a population of 400,000,000. We in America have 135,000,000 people. If this world government is to be operated upon the basis of actual representative government by free people, then representatives of this world order must be chosen accordingly. If that is done, the United States will be outvoted. We will not have an equal place in the family of nations, but we will be expected to pay the bills.

If, as some proponents of this plan contend, the four big nations must be on an equal footing, which one among us is going to say to Russia, with the largest and most powerful army in the world, that she can have no more votes than we have? If she disagrees, is America going to send her sons to war with Russia to compel her to accept the orders of the supergovernment?

For a thousand years Russian rulers have dreamed of and schemed for a warm-water outlet to the sea. Peter the Great built St. Petersburg on the Baltic Sea to have an ocean outlet, but the

Baltic is frozen most of the year. Today is Russia's opportunity. Does anyone doubt that she will make the most of it? If she does, who is going to stop her? Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, even the Balkans or Turkey cannot prevent her. Is it our job to do so? You and I know that it is not, and we are not going to do so. Thus ends the Atlantic Charter and we gain the hatred of every small nation to which we break our promise of self-determination.

Will we say to Great Britain that she cannot have India or Hong Kong or Singapore or Malaya or Egypt or British Guiana or Trinidad?

Are we to say to the Netherlands she cannot have the Dutch East Indies? If we do, whose sons are to do the fighting?

Other problems that confront us and which should be proposed for discussion are our future policy of lend-lease, of U. N. R. R. A., of the fantastic plans of the President's Food Conference.

Russia has stated her demands.

Great Britain says that she does not intend to liquidate the British Empire.

Why should not we state our terms of peace? Certainly Mr. Roosevelt, who has been working on plans for 2 years, can disclose what he has in mind. This need not be concealed upon the ground of military expediency.

The protection of the United States is our fundamental foreign policy. It is the cornerstone of our whole structure of national life. Any stone that does not fit into that structure should be rejected. Any policy that is in derogation of America and of her people should be rejected. America is our first consideration. The world should be told our aims. If we evade or conceal, there will be misunderstandings.

Secretary Hull said that the signing of the Moscow agreement meant the end of the old balance of power.

The Nineteenth Century and After, an English publication founded over 50 years ago and largely representative of British Government policy, printed this statement:

It is fashionable to dismiss the balance of power as an obsolete doctrine. It is not a doctrine. It is, for Great Britain and the empire, the immutable condition of survival. Any power that becomes undisputed master of the European mainland can become master of the British Isles. This is an old truth. If it fades out of the national consciousness and ceases to inform national policy, then the days of England's greatness will be over.

England has no one permanent foe in Europe, for none of her vital interests conflict with the vital interests of any European power. Her only foe is that power, or that coalition of powers, which may endeavor to dominate Europe. Against that foe she must always be ready, always be strong, and always have allies. As her foe varies, so her allies vary. The foe of yesterday may be the ally of tomorrow and the ally of yesterday the foe of tomorrow.

The power of the British Empire, plus the power of Continental allies, will, if the Empire is strong, always balance the power of whatever power seeks domination. And as long as the balance is maintained, there will be peace, for no one power can prevail over the rest of Europe plus the British Empire, as long as the Empire is strong.

This simple mechanism is the balance of power. It exists by virtue of the immutable

physical realities. Neither the League of Nations, nor any system of collective security, nor disarmament can change these realities. As soon as the balance of power is challenged, every collective system will collapse and England will, if she is not to perish, make the counterchallenge. She did so in 1939. England fought to preserve the balance—for that reason and no other.

The nature of the peace must be determined by the enduring realities of the European situation, not by transient phenomena like fascism, socialism, or communism. The exorbitant strength of Germany must be reduced and it must be kept reduced. Better a despotically governed Germany that is not too strong than a liberal Germany that is too strong. The peace that will end the second World War must be such that the balance of power will be restored and will be preserved for generations to come. This must be the primary war aim and peace aim of Great Britain. All other aims are secondary or irrelevant, or insofar as they obstruct and obscure the primary aim, a deadly menace.

The balance is not the cause of war—the failure to maintain it is the cause of war.

Europe cannot submit to a general, uniform federation. When differences are deep, they are not solved but intensified by union. A general federation would not put an end to war but would merely replace war between nations by civil war. It is only when great nations have a certain community of outlook and common vital interests that federation is possible, and by vital we mean essential to life, to sheer existence. The nations between the Baltic and Aegean have this vital interest in common. They are under a double and deadly menace.

Whatever power is master of that region is master of all Europe.

If England were to abdicate in eastern Europe, she would be abdicating in all Europe.

A resolute foreign policy, a firmness in upholding national interests against foreign aspirations that are prejudicial to them, even if these aspirations are those of Allied Powers, is as necessary today as it always was and always will be.

Russia is promoting the disintegration of all Europe and, in particular, of the region between the Baltic and the Aegean. She has declared the future annexation of the eastern half of Poland. By thwarting every attempt at collaboration between Poland and Czechoslovakia and by promoting the disintegration of Yugoslavia in particular and of the Balkans in general, she has isolated Czechoslovakia and now proposes to complete this isolation by inviting the Czechoslovak Government to make its headquarters in Moscow. She is also promoting the disintegration of Rumania. She is determined to secure direct, unimpeded access to the Mediterranean and perhaps even to the Adriatic.

Mr. Molotov, of Russia, says of the Moscow Declaration that—

Any artificial union of small nations would be fraught with most serious consequences not only for those nations but for the future peace of Europe.

The Soviet Union, and this must be especially emphasized, firmly rejects any attempts to launch a policy of a sanitary cordon regardless of the form in which it may be masked. It must be recognized that several projects for federation that have emanated recently from the West reeked pungently of the long bankrupt anti-Soviet policy.

This forthright declaration of aims by Soviet Russia should also be considered with the statements of David J. Dallin, a member of the Moscow Soviet and a publisher of numerous books. I refer particularly to the book, *Soviet Russia's*

Foreign Policy published in 1942 by the Yale University Press. Some of the comments of Mr. Dallin are extremely interesting and enlightening. I quote from the book:

Bukharin stated in a speech on the Communist program: "We have grown up so much that we can conclude a military alliance with the bourgeoisie of any one country and use its help in order to crush the bourgeoisie of another country. This is a question solely of strategical and technical expediency." If as time goes on the bourgeoisie of such an Allied country happens to suffer a defeat, other tasks will arise which you will easily visualize yourselves.

In 1938, almost on the eve of the war, an article of Stalin's was reprinted in the Soviet press and distributed throughout the nation. It stated in part as follows:

Our army is an army of the world revolution, an army of the workers of all countries. Nucleus of world communism, the Soviet Union was the only fatherland, and its defense a national task for the Russians, was an international task for all Communists. Hence, expansion of Soviet territory also became a goal of world communism.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], in his able address of April 2, said:

Our American foreign policy as of today is sound when it puts military victory in this war ahead of every other consideration. Beyond that point, our American foreign policy, as of today, is a vague and often mystifying generality. Frankly, it is largely locked up in the White House.

On January 21, in the *United States News*, David Lawrence, one of the ablest editors of this generation, said:

The President is just back from a conference with Stalin, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek, and from the battle zones. Here was afforded an occasion, too, to interpret to a bewildered humanity, not only inside America but throughout the world, the great aims and purposes for which men die so bravely every hour of the day on some battlefield or on some open sea.

The President in his message has not given us the leadership we need on the home front. Possibly it's because he's tired. Possibly it's because he's poorly advised. The message reads as if it had been patched together by a fatigued mind.

The question may be asked, What, if anything, do I have to propose? I have criticized the State Department's and the President's failure to declare a stable foreign policy. What do I suggest?

The aspirations of all peoples in the world are for peace. A declaration by our State Department or by the President upon what general terms of peace are we willing to terminate the war would be welcomed by all the people of the earth. It is neither necessary nor advisable to give a blueprint of such a proposal. A general statement of peace aims or peace terms can be made now and that is what I hope our State Department will do.

The necessary and fundamental requirements of peace are few and can be quickly named. They are—

Complete disarmament and demobilization of the Axis countries.

Trial of those responsible for the war.

Return of or payment for all loot taken by them.

Complete demobilization of all plane, gun, and munition factories in enemy countries.

Commercial air lines and radios in the Axis countries should be under Allied supervision.

Feeding the people of the war-ravished countries must be by joint contribution.

Adjustment and terms of final settlement of our lend-lease accounts with other governments should be completed.

Complete restoration of the pre-Pearl Harbor status of the Philippine Islands or immediate independence.

Sufficient air bases, American owned and controlled, throughout the world to insure our own defense.

An organization of nations working together in cooperation to insure peace. The Pan American Union was organized in 1890. It has functioned well for 54 years. Why not a similar union of European and Asiatic countries?

A world court of eminent jurists has been suggested. Most lawyers will agree that such a court is desired. On the other hand, Senators, I wish to warn that we do not want a court having such power that it can interpret the agreements we may make in the future, or whatever action the American Government may take.

An Army, Navy, and Air Force of sufficient power to protect us against any aggressor.

A declaration now that our foreign policy includes these proposals will bring an earlier and less costly peace.

The world is gloomy today and rightly so, but peace will come just so surely as spring will come again with its flowers and birds and happiness. Winter, with its cold and snow and desolate days, is always followed by the resurrection. So the spring of peace will follow the winter of war.

Loss of life and material must be endured. Many of our young men will not return. But with the coming of peace we will build again for the future. Only the loss of life is irreparable, and that is why we are bound, if we attain nothing else, to make certain within the range of our ability to prevent its recurrence.

The President's foreign policy stands on the record, convicted of uncertainty and confusion.

It is vague, changeable, and unconvincing.

It displays a lack of confidence by the President in the people.

It breeds suspicion and fear.

It shows a lack of trust in Congress, the coordinate branch of our Government.

In the face of that record I hope the President will abandon secret conferences, commitments, agreements, and proposals. Open covenants, openly arrived at, as President Wilson said, will cement America in a foreign policy that will safeguard us from every danger that the future may hold.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. STEWART. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations (and withdrawing a nomination), which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, and nomination withdrawn, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Robert J. Carson to be ensign in the Coast Guard, to rank from the date of oath as ensign.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Francis L. Spalding, of Massachusetts, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

Walter C. Dowling, of Georgia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

Max Waldo Bishop, of Iowa, now a Foreign Service officer of class 6 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

John L. Bankhead, of North Carolina, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

L. Randolph Higgs, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul;

J. Rives Childs, of Virginia, now a Foreign Service officer of class 3 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general; and

Philip D. Sprouse, of Tennessee, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul.

By Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Gordon Rowe, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue while serving as commander Fleet Air, Quonset Point; and

Capt. Malcolm F. Schoeffel, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of July 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

PREVIOUS CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATION OF SENATOR BONE TO BE JUDGE, UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I desire to speak briefly of a situation which has arisen and which has given me and others some concern.

On April 1 the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] stated to the Senate that the rules of this committee required that when a nomination for a judgeship was sent to it, a week's notice of a hearing on the nomination should be given that any one caring to protest confirmation might appear before the committee for that purpose. He added that a Member of the Senate had been named for such a place. At that time, however, the nomination had not been referred to the committee.

The Senator from Nevada, with his customary frankness, further told us that

on that morning, that is on the morning of April 1, he had hurriedly called a meeting of his committee at which only a quorum—6 members of a total membership of 18—attended. We were also advised by the Senator from Nevada that the committee had directed him to take the floor to ask unanimous consent that our colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] nominated to be a judge of the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, be confirmed without the nomination being referred to the committee. This request was thereupon made and agreed to. The nomination by this means came before the Senate and the question of confirmation of the nomination was forthwith presented to the Senate.

Brief words of appreciation of the character and service of the Senator from Washington were spoken by the distinguished majority leader and by myself, and thereupon confirmation of the nomination was voted.

This whole proceeding upon this nomination involved the waiver of established rules of the Senate and, as a consequence of such waiver, the avoidance of a long recognized rule of the Judiciary Committee.

The minority members join with the majority in consenting that the nomination need not be sent to the Judiciary Committee, and in agreeing that the question of confirmation might be put on the day the nomination was received, the Senate rule to the contrary notwithstanding. We on this side were asked by this course to show and do courtesy to a colleague, and the minority, without a dissent, joined with the majority in the expression of good will to our colleague and, with unanimous voice, voted his confirmation.

Mr. President, these events thus outlined happened 3 weeks ago and ever since rumors have circulated in the press and among others, that our colleague will not take the oath of his new office until all possibility of the appointment of a Republican successor has passed. The political import of these rumors we may disregard. This is unimportant. One more Republican or one less Democrat will not affect in any consequential degree the political complexion of this body during this Congress. Moreover, I am unable to believe that Senator BONE would be a willing participant in such a plan and purpose.

But there are aspects of this case which are of major import. We of the minority accorded Senator BONE the courtesy of immediate confirmation. In the request for such action and in the statements made to the Senate there was implicit the expectation and the assurance that there would be prompt consummation of the nomination and of our confirmation by the assumption of the judicial office by the confirmed Senator. There could be no other reason or justification for the requested speed in action. Mr. President, the comity which should exist between the sides of this Chamber and the courtesy, one to the other, which should distinguish our relationships, require that full faith and credit shall be given by all of us to understandings whether they be found in

written or spoken words, or in the course of events. Failure in the present circumstances to assume this judicial position as soon as practicable I would regard as a default in this obligation.

Moreover, Mr. President, every thinking Senator must recognize the incongruity of the situation confronting the Senate. This body, so far as we have voice in the matter, has acted. We have approved the appointment of our colleague to a judicial office. Is our colleague to sit among us, to act with us, to exercise the functions and enjoy the emoluments of a Senator after we have played our part in bestowing another honor upon him and have confirmed him in this new place of distinction? No sophistries and no evil precedents can make compatible these two offices of Senator and Justice of a high court of the United States. The judicial office, the judicial obligations should not be subordinated beyond a necessary hour, to the convenience of individuals, or to the exigencies of political life.

I recognize that this is the last day upon which a motion to reconsider the vote of confirmation of Senator BONE can be made. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington has intellectual integrity. He is not devious, but is direct. He abhors sham and subterfuge. I have, therefore, no question that he will recognize, if he does not already do so, the embarrassment the present circumstances cause to many who have for him only good wishes, and the impropriety of this duality of position in which unwise friends would place him. To move now a reconsideration of the vote of confirmation would, in my view, cast doubt upon the sincerity of those upon this side who by vote and voice have heretofore expressed confidence in our colleague. I am content to trust to the judgment and conscience of the Senator from Washington to do, in the appropriate time, that which is right in this matter. I shall therefore make no move to bring about reconsideration of our earlier confirmation, and I express the hope that no other Senator of the minority will do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate, as I am sure Senator BONE does, the very fine and generous attitude expressed by the Senator from Maine.

Of course, there is nothing new in the confirmation by the Senate of Members of the Senate appointed to judicial or other positions, without the formality of reference to a committee. Such action has not been peculiar to any political party. As far back as I can remember there has never been objection to the immediate confirmation by the Senate of the appointment of one of its Members to any position where confirmation has been necessary, with one exception. That was in regard to the appointment of a Democratic Member of the Senate to the Supreme Court, in which case this rule of courtesy was not followed.

There is reason for the practice which has been followed. We serve here with one another, we know one another, we know the character and standing of our colleagues. The reason for the rule sending nominations to a committee is that the committee may investigate the

character and the fitness of the appointee for the position to which he has been designated. It is easy to understand why from time immemorial, with the one exception to which I have referred, the Senate always has by unanimous consent waived the formality of reference to a committee, because the Senate has known its own Members, Senators have known their own colleagues, and therefore investigation by a committee in order to ascertain the fitness of such an appointee was not necessary. Because of that fact, the custom of immediate confirmation has grown up. Of course, immediate action can always be frustrated by a single objection.

When Senator BONE's nomination came to the Senate I expressed my regret that he had been appointed to the bench, because he has been an able Senator, we all respect him, and I regarded him, and still regard him, as a valuable Member of this body. But if he had any desire to go on the bench, and the President desired to appoint him, of course, there was nothing I could say about it except to express my regret that he was leaving the Senate.

I have not seen the Senator from Washington since his appointment, and have not talked to him personally about it. I think I am in a position to say, however, that no one who has said anything about it had any authority from the Senator to discuss his intentions with reference to the judicial appointment.

Rumors began to float around, the responsibility for which I know nothing, but I have here a statement which has been handed to me by the secretary of Senator BONE, the Senator now being in the hospital. The statement was sent to me to be read in the Senate if the matter came up in any form. Therefore I feel it not only my duty, but it is my pleasure, to read the statement to the Senate, so that Senators may understand, insofar as the statement discloses, exactly what Senator BONE's attitude and his situation are. This is a memorandum prepared for me:

Senator BONE has expressed the hope that if remarks are made with regard to the date at which he will take oath of office as Judge, the following statement be placed in the RECORD:

"I am going to be in the hospital for an indefinite period. My plans after that are yet to be determined. Nobody in the Senate has ever talked to me about my plans."

I think the RECORD ought also to show that Senator BONE entered the Naval Hospital at Bethesda on April 1, before his name came down from the President. He had no knowledge of how the confirmation was to be handled. He is very grateful to his colleagues for having expressed their confidence in him by giving the confirmation in such a quick manner.

Senator BONE suffered a broken femur in 1939. At that time he underwent a prolonged period of hospitalization. Complications set in which forced him to enter the Mayo clinic last year for another operation, and he spent 4 months there. Upon returning here, he has undergone constant physiotherapy in the hope of obtaining some improvement. This physiotherapy continued until the time he entered the Naval Hospital. Physiotherapy was not sufficient. Now, at the Naval Hospital he is undergoing more radical type of treatment, including

the application of a heavy brace to his leg. This makes it impossible for him to do anything other than stay at the hospital until further developments. The doctors do not know how long he will have to be there.

Attention should be called to the fact that if he were now to take the judgeship and go out to San Francisco, he would have to enter a hospital there for treatment similar to that he is receiving here. He thinks it is best to take care of his physical condition now in the hope that a permanent cure will be effected.

Mr. President, that is a statement authorized by Senator BONE. I am sure it is sincere, and we all sympathize with him on account of his condition and appreciate the embarrassment under which he labors because of it.

I thought that in justice to Senator BONE, in view of the rumors to which reference has been made, this statement should be made for the RECORD, and for the benefit of those who may be interested in the matter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, when this delicate question in Senate relationships came up through publication of various disturbing rumors in the press, I felt that the key to the whole situation was Senator BONE's own personal attitude toward the situation in which he finds himself, and my own complete confidence in Senator BONE's shining integrity was such that I felt that if it were possible to get any direct word from him it would clear up the entire unfortunate controversy regarding a long delay in his induction as a Federal judge while he still sat as a Senator following his Senate confirmation.

Under those circumstances I wrote Senator BONE a letter and gave it to his secretary to transmit to Senator BONE at the hospital, with the understanding that it should not be presented if it was calculated in any way to disturb him in his unfortunate illness. The letter was presented, and the secretary replied to me orally substantially in the language which the Senator from Kentucky has read, although I think perhaps the oral statement went a little further.

If I correctly understand the attitude of the Senator from Washington, he is unable at the moment to anticipate when his recuperation may permit him to leave the hospital, and certainly no one, by any stretch of the imagination, could attribute any impropriety to whatever delay in assuming his new judicial office shall be occasioned by his continuation in the hospital. Certainly he has our total sympathy in his long and painful illness.

I further gather that upon his release from the hospital he intends to conclude the liquidation of his 12 years of office records and Senate responsibilities as expeditiously as possible, and intends, within reasonable time thereafter, to proceed upon his way to his new high assignment to the circuit court of the United States.

It is because of these facts that I entirely concur with the statement made by the Senator from Maine that nothing further shall be done about the matter in the Senate at the present time. Otherwise I should feel that a very serious principle would be involved in this situa-

tion and that a motion to reconsider the confirmation should be made for procedural reasons and without any reflection whatever upon the character or qualifications of the able senior Senator from Washington.

I cannot forget—and I think we may as well be frank about it—the situation which was presented in the Senate when another able Senator from Washington was appointed to the bench, and his appointment similarly was immediately confirmed by the Senate unanimously, and without reference to the committee. The confirmation went to the White House, and there it remained in a pigeonhole, shall we say, for several months, before the commission was issued, to the great and constant embarrassment of the Senator himself. I felt at that time that it was an utterly anomalous position in which the Senator himself and the Senate and the judiciary were placed by that unfortunate and illogical hiatus.

The Constitution of the United States says specifically:

No person holding any office under the United States, shall be a Member of either house during his continuance in Office.

Of course, that cannot be applied literally to cases of the nature of the one before us, because in the present instance, for example—as was true in the former—the Senator from Washington technically is not holding a judicial office at the present time. Therefore there is no literal conflict with the constitutional rule. But, in cold fact, there is an obvious and ominous collision. Mr. President, clearly under such circumstances there is a direct and specific conflict not only with the purpose of the constitutional rule, but with the indisputable necessity which underlies the rule.

Under the theory of the American Government, the judicial branch of our Government and the legislative branch are two totally distinct, separate, and independent institutions; and by no stretch of the imagination is it possible to defend an indefinite duality of tenure as between the judiciary and the legislature. I feel very keenly upon that point; and if there were the slightest reason to place any credence in the stories which have appeared in the newspapers that a judge-designate intends to remain indefinitely in his senatorial status, I should be one of those who, despite my great affection and complete respect and confidence for the Senator from Washington, would wish to interpose a motion to reconsider for the purpose of keeping the record straight—even though I would subsequently vote to reconfirm.

I may add that word came to me that the Senator from Washington had never indicated to any newspaper that he had any such intention at any time. Under the circumstances I, too, am completely willing to rely upon my opinion of the fine character and integrity of the able senior Senator from Washington. It must be remembered in this connection, of course, that the Senator cannot take his oath until the President issues his commission. It was the President, let me make it plain, who was responsible

for the long delay upon the previous occasion to which I have referred. I simply express the hope that we may never again confront any such insufferable precedent as the one which was involved upon this previous occasion; because in my judgment any such lapse between confirmation and induction runs squarely counter to the basic theory upon which constitutional government exists in the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James L. Underhill, to be major general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas E. Watson, to be major general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel C. Cumming, to be brigadier general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oliver P. Smith, to be brigadier general.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of all confirmations of nominations made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

AUSTIN L. TIERNEY

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to enter a motion in connection with Senate bill 176, for the relief of Austin L. Tierney, a minor bill which passed the Senate and also passed the House, following which action conferees on the part of the Senate were named.

The bill is now pending in the House of Representatives. Therefore, I enter a motion that the Senate reconsider its action in appointing conferees on the part of the Senate on Senate bill 176.

I now move that the House of Representatives be requested to return the bill, with the accompanying papers, to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILEY in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

The motion was agreed to.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 23 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, April 24, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 21 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

ADMINISTRATOR, UNITED STATES HOUSING AUTHORITY

Philip M. Klutznick, of Nebraska, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency, vice Herbert Emmerich.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Austin J. Mahoney, of Rochester, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 8, with headquarters at Rochester, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

Martin O. Bement, of Buffalo, N. Y., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 9, with headquarters at Buffalo, N. Y. (Reappointment.)

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of October 1943:

Donald B. Hubbard, a citizen of North Carolina.

Frank W. Stopinski, Jr., a citizen of Alabama.

Myron K. Minnick, a citizen of California.

William R. Shockley, a citizen of Missouri.

Edward R. Messer, a citizen of Kentucky.

Redge F. Henn, Jr., a citizen of California.

John C. Pritchett, a citizen of Texas.

Staff Sgt. Richard C. Andrews, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 3d day of November 1943.

The below-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 4th day of February 1944:

Wilson B. Baugh, Jr., a citizen of Florida.

Robert W. Allen, a citizen of New Jersey.

Frederick R. Korf, a citizen of Connecticut.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 21 (legislative day of April 12), 1944.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be major generals

James L. Underhill

Thomas E. Watson

To be brigadier generals

Samuel C. Cumming

Oliver P. Smith

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Helen E. Sellers, Banks.
Attie D. Hancock, Gardendale.
Paul B. Curtis, Glenwood.
Duncan G. Kimbrough, Harpersville.

ARKANSAS

Louella Boswell, Almyra.
Mary L. Cherry, Bay.
Claude Gregory, Cash.
Harriet M. Shrigley, Coal Hill.
Erma M. Odom, Fulton.

CALIFORNIA

William H. Frost, Etiwanda.

INDIANA

Ruth I. Perin, Glenwood.
Maurice G. Fougereousse, Jasonville.
Crystal B. Shaw, Markleville.
Claude M. Bowman, Norman.

KENTUCKY

Thomas E. Hite, Philpot.

MAINE

Hilda E. Sawtelle, East Wilton.

MISSISSIPPI

Irma E. Blanks, Collinsville.
Sallie C. Walker, Lauderdale.
Charles E. Elliott, Mayersville.
Bessie Abernathy, Woodland.

NEW YORK

Luther C. Empie, Guilderland Center.

OKLAHOMA

William F. Goff, Jones.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Norton H. Campbell, Jr., Pendleton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Thomas J. Evans, Chattaroy.
Loma L. Nester, Eckman.
John E. Hafer, Elkview.
Harry O. Lockman, Helen.
Usher A. Cobb, Kopperston.
Clara L. Hardy, Montcalm.
James H. Trail, Winding Gulf.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate April 21 (legislative day of April 12), 1944:

NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY

Philip M. Klutznick to be Federal Public Housing Commissioner.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1944

(Legislative day of Wednesday, April 12, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, as a new day lights up a stricken and struggling world and a battle raging with ever-increasing fury, our weary souls seek the pavilion of Thy changeless love where beyond these voices there is peace. The earth which waits to be a watered garden and the happy habitation of Thy children, whom Thou has made of one blood, lies in darkness, anguish, and tears, rocked by explosive hatred. Man has forsaken meekness and mercy and slighted Thy

word. Forgetting that ever there standeth Thine immutable law that only the meek finally inherit the good life, refusing to bend at the lowly gate of humility and sacrifice, he has lost the road to truth and goodness and reaps in this awful hour the bitter harvest of cruelty, persecution, division, and dissension.

From the valley of futility and despair we lift our eyes to the hills of eternal verities which stab the horizon like great and glorious steeples pointing to the sky; for we know our help and our hope is in Thee who made heaven and earth.

"God the All-righteous One! man hath defied Thee;

Yet to eternity standeth Thy Word; Falsehood and wrong shall not tarry beside Thee;

Give to us peace in our time, O Lord."

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, April 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES, 1929, VOLUMES II AND III

A letter from the Secretary of State, calling attention to the release of three volumes entitled "Papers Relating to the Foreign Relations of the United States, 1929," and stating that copies of the document edition of the set (H. Doc. No. 517, 71st Cong., 2d sess.) will be available to Members from the folding room (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT OF ACT GRANTING INCREASED COMPENSATION TO SUBSTITUTE POSTAL EMPLOYEES

A letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend an act to grant increases in compensation to substitute employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes, Public, No. 266, Seventy-eighth Congress, chapter 134, second session (H. R. 2836), approved March 24, 1944 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS DATA

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancellations, and miscellaneous irrigation data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects, compiled as of June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PERSONNEL REQUIREMENTS

Letters from the Under Secretary of the Interior, the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and the Acting Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, estimates of personnel requirements for

their respective offices, etc., for the quarter ending June 30, 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

CLAIM OF J. FLETCHER LANKTON AND JOHN N. ZIEGELE

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of J. Fletcher Lankton and John N. Ziegele against the United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Claims.

PAYMENT FOR ACCUMULATED LEAVE DUE GOVERNMENTAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for lump-sum payments for accumulated leave due to Government officers and employees at death or upon separation from the service (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Civil Service.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE (S. Doc. No. 185)

A letter from the Secretary of the Senate, transmitting, pursuant to law, his annual report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1943 (with an accompanying report); ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FEBRUARY 1944 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the transactions of the Corporation for the month of February 1944 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, submitting, pursuant to law, the eighth report of the Administration covering the period ended December 31, 1943 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ELECTRIC POWER REQUIREMENTS OF INDUSTRIAL ESTABLISHMENTS

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a copy of its newly issued report entitled "Electric Power Requirements of Industrial Establishments" 1939-42 (actual) and 1943 and 1944 (estimated) (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

CHAIRMANSHIP OF COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from Alpha Omega Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, Washington, D. C., relating to the chairmanship of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—RESOLUTION OF CHAMPLAIN VALLEY COUNCIL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and ask to have referred to the appropriate committee a resolution favoring the St. Lawrence seaway adopted by the executive committee of the Champlain Valley Council on April 17 last.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the Champlain Valley Council has consistently advocated the St. Lawrence